[William Sherlock]

Imprimatur,

C. Alston, R. P. D. Hen. Epiſc. Lond. à Sacris Domeſticis.

Martii 29. 1686.

[William Sherlock]

Imprimatur,

C. Alston, R. P. D. Hen. Epiſc. Lond. à Sacris Domeſticis.

Martii 29. 1686.

AN

ANSWER

TO A

DISCOURSE

INTITULED,

Papists Protesting against Protestant-Popery;

Being a VINDICATION of

Papists not Misrepresented by Protestants:

And Containing

A Particular Examination of Monsieur *de MEAUX*, late Bishop of *Condom*, his Exposition of the Doctrine of the CHURCH of *ROME*, in the Articles

OF

INVOCATION of SAINTS,

AND THE

WORSHIP of IMAGES,

Occasioned by that Discourse.

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY. NEW YORK

LONDON:

Printed for *John Amery* at the *Peacock*, and *William Rogers* at the *Sun*; both against St. *Dunstan's* Church in *Fleetstreet*.

MDCLXXXVI.

AN ANSWER TO Papiſts Proteſting AGAINST Proteſtant Popery:

SINCE the Proteſter thinks my Anſwer to his Reflections ſo great a Complement, I am reſolved to oblige him a little farther, and to complement him very heartily, and I ſee no reaſon, but Complementing may be as good a word for Diſputing, as Repreſenting is.

The Reply conſiſted of two parts, 1. Concerning the Miſrepreſentation of a Papiſt. 2. Concerning the Rule of true Repreſenting, and I ſhall conſider, what the Proteſting Papiſt ſays to each of them.

As for the Firſt, a Miſrepreſenter is ſo foul a Character, that no Man can wonder, if we think our ſelves concern'd to wipe off ſuch an imputation: and therefore I expreſly denied the charge, and made it appear from comparing his own Characters of a Papiſt Miſrepreſented, and Repreſented together, that we had not charged them falſly in any matter of Fact, and therefore are no Miſrepreſenters: for if we charge them with believing and doing nothing, but

what they themſelves confeſs to be their Faith and Practice, wherein is the Miſrepreſentation? Thus I particularly ſhowed, that all matters of Fact (excepting ſome points, wherein they diſown the Doctrine of their own Church) in the Character of the Papiſt Miſrepreſented, are confeſſed and defended in the Character of the Papiſt Repreſented; and the Proteſter himſelf acknowledges, that *I have learnedly* (as he is pleaſed to ſpeak) *diſtinguiſhed between matters of Diſpute, and of Repreſentation*; and if ſo, then he ought to own, that we do not Miſrepreſent them: and this is all I undertook to prove in the firſt part of my Reply, and for that reaſon gave it the Title of, *A Papiſt not Miſrepreſented by Proteſtants*, wholly with relation to his Character of a Papiſt Miſrepreſented, which I had proved to contain nothing in it, which in a ſtrict and proper ſenſe can be called a Miſrepreſentation. We truly relate what the Faith and Practice of the Church of *Rome* is, and this is true Repreſenting; and though we ſay their Faith is erroneous, and their Practices corrupt or ſuperſtitious, contrary to the Laws of God, and the uſages of the Primitive Church; yet whether this be true or falſe, it is no matter of Repreſentation but Diſpute; though we believe thus of their Faith and Practice, we do not charge them with believing ſo, and therefore do not Miſrepreſent a Papiſt. Whether they or we be in the right is matter of Diſpute, and not to be determined by Character-making, but by an appeal to the Laws of God, and the dictates of right Reaſon, and the Authentick Records of the ancient Church. While we agree about matter of Fact there can be no Miſrepreſenting on either ſide, for there is a great deal of difference between a Miſrepreſentation, and a falſe Judgment of things; and thus I hoped, the talk of Miſrepreſenting would have been at an end.

But our Author, though he confeſſes I am in the right, will have us to be Miſrepreſenters ſtill; He ſays, *I declare plainly, that Popery is really that Antichriſtian Religion, which Proteſtants ſay it is, that it teaches and practiſes all thoſe ſopperies, ſuperſtitions and non-ſenſe, which have at any time been charged againſt it by Proteſtants.* But I never ſaid any ſuch thing yet, but only ſaid and proved, that all matters of Fact complained of in

the

the Character of a Papiſt Miſrepreſented, are owned by himſelf in the Character of a Papiſt Repreſented; and this, I thought, was proof enough, that we were no Miſrepreſenters. But the Title of my Reply offends him, *A Papiſt not Miſrepreſented by Proteſtants*, which he ſays, *is a condemnation of the Religion to all thoſe horrid ſhapes and monſtrous forms, it has been at any time expoſed in by Members of the Reformation*; by no means! If there have been other Miſrepreſentations of them, which our Author has not yet given us an account of, I can ſay nothing to them, till I ſee what they are; but my Title related only to my Book, and that related only to the Character of a Papiſt Miſrepreſented, which our Author had given us, and I undertook for that then, and will defend it ſtill, that there is no Miſrepreſentation in it.

Of the ſame nature is what he adds, That *I tell my Reader in the name of all my Brethren, we charge them* (the Papiſts) *with nothing, but what they expreſly profeſs to believe, and what they practiſe*; and thus ſays the Proteſter, *in this one aſſertion vouches for the truth of all that infamy, and prophaneneſs, which is laid at their doors*: and thus, for ought I ſee, I am drawn in for a great deal more than I intended; I ſpoke with reference to his Characters, and now I muſt diſcharge the ſcores of all Proteſtants ſince the beginning of the Reformation; but when a Man's in, he muſt get out as well as he can: but would not one wonder, that there ſhould not be one word of his own Characters all this while? that inſtead of defending his own Miſrepreſentations, which he has ſo unjuſtly father'd upon us, he ſhould be hunting about to pick up ſome new Miſrepreſentations for me to anſwer? There muſt be a reaſon for this, and I believe, I can gueſs what it is.

But however he takes this occaſion to ranſack the Writings of Proteſtants, and to ſee what fine things they have ſaid of Papiſts, and to collect a new Character of a Papiſt Miſrepreſented out of them. *For ſince all that proceeds from a Popiſh hand of this nature is ſuſpected and challenged, and the double Character of a Papiſt Miſrepreſented and Repreſented* (*about which, as the Replier ſays, there is ſo much pother and noiſe*) *is queſtioned as to its method, its ſincerity, and exactneſs, we'll now follow our Author's call, and learn what Popery is, from the Pens of Proteſtants,*

ſtants, and eſpecially from ſome of thoſe, who are ſuppoſed to know what Popery is. And thus our Author makes as many turnings and doublings as ever any poor Hare did, which was almoſt run down. Becauſe I have proved, that his Character of a Papiſt Miſrepreſented, contains no Miſrepreſentation in it, properly ſo called, therefore forſooth we will not take Characters from a Papiſt, becauſe we confute them, as ſoon as they make them, which is not very civil; and therefore hoping that we will be more civil to Proteſtant Characters, he turns off the Diſpute to them; never did any Man take more pains to defend Popery, than he does to prove a Papiſt to be Miſrepreſented; it ſeems there is ſomething in the World called Popery, which he is very much aſhamed of, and it is well if it does not prove to be his own beloved Popery at laſt.

I had told him as plainly as I could in Anſwer to his Character of a Papiſt Miſrepreſented, what I called Popery, and what I take to be the general ſenſe of Proteſtants about it, and ſhewed him evidently, that what he calls a Miſrepreſentation is none; nay in moſt caſes I have allow'd his own Character of a Papiſt Repreſented, and ſurely there is no Miſrepreſentation in that, unleſs he has miſrepreſented a Papiſt himſelf; and why is he not ſatisfied with this? why ſo much Zeal to prove us Miſrepreſenters, when we are willing to fall with the Market, and to abate as much in the Notion and Idea of Popery, as they are pleaſed to lower it? Why muſt we be bound to juſtifie that Repreſentation of Popery, which ſome Proteſtants have formerly made of it, when Popery was quite another thing, than the Biſhop of *Condom*, and the Repreſenter have now made it, any more than they are bound to juſtifie every thing, which *Thomas Aquinas*, or *Bellarmin*, or *Vaſquez* have taught for Popery?

But let us conſider that Character, he has made of a Papiſt out of the Writings of Proteſtants, only I muſt put him in mind, that he muſt ſtill diſtinguiſh between matters of Repreſentation and Diſpute. If the matter of Fact they charge them with be true, they are no Miſrepreſenters; as for their Reaſons and Arguments, I will no more undertake to defend all the reaſonings of Proteſtants,

teſtants, than I ſuppoſe, our Proteſter will all the reaſonings of Papiſts.

The firſt Miſrepreſenter, he brings upon the Stage, is *John* Lord Archbiſhop of *York* in his Manual or three ſmall and plain Treatiſes, written for the uſe of a Lady, to preſerve her from the danger of Popery. And all that I ſhall ſay to this, is, that if what he tranſcribes out of his Book, be a Miſrepreſentation, it is not a Proteſtant, but a Popiſh, Miſrepreſentation. For the Archbiſhop cites his Authors for what he ſays, as the very Title of the Chapter tells us, which I ſhall here preſent to the Reader, with all the References and Authorities as they are Printed in his Book, and leave the Proteſter to conſider of a good Reaſon, why he left all theſe Authorities out.

CHAP. VI.

Reaſons of refuſal to leave the Romiſh Religion, collected out of Printed Authors.

I cannot leave my Religion. *Pap.*

I. *Reaſon.*

BEcauſe we muſt ſimply believe the Church of *Rome*, whether it teach true or falſe. *Stapl. Antidot in Evang. Luk.* 10. 16. *pag.* 528.

And if the Pope believe there is *no life to come*, we muſt believe it as an Article of our Faith. *Bulgradus.*

And we muſt not hear *Proteſtant* Preachers, though they preach the *Truth*. *Rhem. upon Tit.* 3. 10. And for your Scripture, we little weigh it. For the Word of God, if it be not expounded as the Church of *Rome* will have it, is the word of the Devil. *Hoſius de expreſſo verbo Dei.*

II. *Reaſon.*

II. *Reason.*

You rely too much upon the *Gospel*, and S. *Paul's* Epistles in your Religion; whereas, the Gospel is but a Fable of Christ, as Pope *Leo* the tenth tells us. *Apol. of H. Stephen fol.* 358. *Smeton. contra Hamilton pag* 104.

And the Pope can *dispense* against the *New Testament*. *Panormit. extra de divortiis.*

And he may check, when he pleases, the Epistles of S. *Paul*. *Carolus Ruinus Cancil.* 109. *num.* 1. *Volum.* 5.

And controul any thing avouched by all the Apostles. *Rota in decis.* 1. *num.* 3. *in noviss. Anton. Maria in addit. ad decis. Rota nov. de Big. n.* 10. And there is an *eternal* Gospel, to wit, that of the *Holy Ghost*, which puts down *Christs*. *Cirellus a Carmelite* set it forth.

III. *Reason.*

You attribute all your Salvation to *Faith* in Christ alone. Whereas, He is the Saviour of *Men* only, but of no *Women*. *Dial. of* Dives *and* Pauper, *compl.* 6. *cited by* Rogers *upon the Artic.* and *Postellus in Jesuits Catech. l.* 1. *cap.* 10.

For Women are saved by
- S. Clare. — *Som. in Morn. de Eccles. cap.* 9.
- *Mother* Jane. — *Postellus in Jesuits Catech. Lib.* 8. *cap.* 10.

Nay to speak properly, S. *Francis* hath redeemed as many, as are saved since his days. *Conformit. of S.* Fran.

And the blood of S. *Thomas à Becket. Hor. Beat. Virg.*

And sometimes one man, by his satisfactions, redeems another. *Test. Rhem. in Rom.* 8. 17.

IV.

IV. *Reaſon.*

In your Church there is but one way to remiſſion of ſins, which you call Faith in Chriſt; but we have many. For we put away

Our { *Venials*, with a little Holy Water, *Teſt. Rhem. in Rom.* 8. 17.
Mortals, by { 1. Merits of the B. Virg. *Hor. B. Virg.*
2. The Blood of *Becket*, *Ib.*
3. *Agnos Dei*, *or* Holy Lambs, *Cerem. l.* 1. *c.* 7.
4. Little parcels of the Goſpel, *Breviar.*
5. Becoming *Franciſcans*, *conf. l.* 1. *fol.* 101.
6. A Biſhops pardon for 40 days, a Cardinals for an 100. days, and the Popes for ever. *Taxa Camer. apud. Eſp. in* 1 *ad Tim.*

V. *Reaſon.*

You ſtand too preciſely upon your *Sacraments*, and require a true *Faith*, in the partakers. Whereas with us, to become a *Monk*, or a *Nun*, is as good as the Sacrament of *Baptiſm. Aquin. de Ingreſ. Relig. l.* 2. *c.* 21.

And the very true and real *Body of Chriſt* may be devoured of Dogs, Hogs, Cats and Rats, *Alex. Hales*, *part.* 4. *q.* 45. *Thom. parte* 3. *q.* 8. *art.* 3.

VI. *Reaſon.*

Then for your Miniſters, every one is allowed to have his *Wife*; or elſe inforced to live *chaſtly*: whereas with us, the Pope himſelf cannot diſpenſe with a Prieſt to *marry*, no more than he can priviledge him to take a *Purſe*. *Turrianus* found fault withal by *Caſſan. conſult. art.* 23.

But Whoredom is allowed all the year long. *See* Sparks's *Diſcovery*, *pag.* 13. *and conſtitut. Othen. de concubit. Cleric. removend.*

And

And another ſin for *June*, *July*, *Auguſt*, which you muſt not know of: *Allowed for this time by* Sixtus Quartus *to all the Family of the Cardinal of S. Lucie, Veſſel. Grovingenſ. tract. de indulgent. citat. à Jacob. Laurent. Jeſuit. lib. pag.* 196. *vide Jo. Wolfii lection. memorab. centen.* 15. *pag.* 836.

For indeed the *wickedneſs* of the Church-men is a prime Argument of the worthineſs of the *Roman* Church. *Bellar. l.* 4. *de Rom. Pont. cap.* 14. *artic.* 28.

And the Pope can make that *righteous*, which is *unrighteous*, *l.* 1. *Decretal. Greg. tit.* 7. *c.* 5.

And yet can no Man ſay unto him, Sir, why do you ſo? *In extrav. tom.* 22. *titul.* 5. *c. ad Apoſtolatus.*

VII. *and laſt Reaſon.*

You in the Church of *England* have caſt off the Biſhop of *Rome*, whereas the Biſhop of *Rome* is a God. *Diſt.* 96. *c. ſatis evidenter, & Panorm. cap. Quanto Abbas.*

The Uſe and Application of this Doctrine you may find in the next Chapter, and a particular proof that ſome Doctrines of the Roman Church *deſtroy juſtice towards Men in all relations*; *as the Popes power of diſpenſing with the duties of all relations*: *their Doctrines of probabilities, of mental reſervations, that the intention regulates the action, that no Faith is to be kept with Hereticks*; *that the Pope may depoſe Princes, and diſpoſe of their Kingdoms, pardon, nay canonize King-killers, and abſolve Subjects from their Allegiance*, &c.

I know our Author calls all this Miſrepreſentation, but that is not our Diſpute now; but whoſe Miſrepreſentation it is. It is plain, this is not *Proteſtant but Popiſh Popery*; for not Proteſtants, but Papiſts, were the Original Authors: And I doubt not, were it worth the while, it might eaſily be proved, that the groſſeſt Miſrepreſentations, which this Author charges on Proteſtants, are only tranſcribed out of Popiſh Authors; and this he ſeems to own, when he is ſo angry with us for proving theſe Miſrepreſentations, as he calls them, by appealing to their own private, but approved, Doctors, who have in plain terms aſſerted thoſe things, which poor Proteſtants muſt not repeat after them, without incurring the Cenſure of Miſrepreſenters.

Now

Now though we grant, that every Doctrine, which we find in Popiſh Authors, ought not to be accounted an Article of the Romiſh Faith, yet if ſuch Books be publiſhed by the authority of Superiors, and when they are publiſhed and known in the World, eſcape the Inquiſition and the *Index expurgatorius*, the Doctrines contained in them ought at leaſt to be looked on, as licenſed and tolerated Doctrines, and therefore conſiſtent with the Romiſh Faith, not a Miſrepreſentation of it. For will a Church ſo ſtrict and ſevere in its Diſcipline, and ſo jealous of Hereſies, which cenſures all the Ancient Fathers, and expunges out of their Writings every paſſage, which in the leaſt ſavours of Hereſie; which will not entruſt the People to uſe the Bible for fear of their learning Hereſie from it; I ſay will ſuch a Church ſuffer their own Doctors to publiſh ſuch Opinions to the World, as Miſrepreſent her own Faith and Worſhip, without condemning, or paſſing the leaſt cenſure on them?

And therefore though we cannot prove from theſe private Doctors, what the Faith of the Church of *Rome* is, and what all are bound to believe, who are of that Communion, yet by their Authority we may confute the charge of Miſrepreſentation. For no Proteſtant can be juſtly accuſed of Miſrepreſenting the Doctrines of the Church of *Rome*, who charges them with no Doctrines, but what are allowed to be taught in that Church, as all thoſe Doctrines are, which are allowed by publick Authority to be Printed and Read in the Communion of that Church, eſpecially, as I obſerved before, where the Preſs is kept under ſuch ſtrict Diſcipline, as it is in the Church of *Rome*.

We muſt not indeed charge all Papiſts with believing ſuch Doctrines, becauſe all are not bound to believe them, as they are to believe the Decrees and Definitions of their Councils; but we may ſay, that they are not contrary to the Faith of the Church, becauſe all Papiſts are allowed to believe them, who will; for I preſume all Men are allowed to believe that, which any Man among them is allowed to teach.

However I hope, it may be ſome excuſe to the Archbiſhop, that he Miſrepreſents only at ſecond hand, (ſince

our Author will have it to be a Misrepresentation) and says no more than some Papists themselves say, and resolves all into the Credit and Authority of his Authors; and I cannot think it a greater fault in a Protestant to give an account of such pernicious Doctrines and Opinions, as are owned by some of their own Writers, than it is in the Church of *Rome* to suffer them to be published by Authority, and to pass without any Censure, if they dislike the Doctrine.

As for what he transcribes out of Doctor *Beard* and Mr. *Sutcliff*, I presume, he intended we should take it all upon his Authority; for he has not directed us, where to find any of those passages he has cited, and it is a little too much to read two great Books in Quarto to pick them out. Without looking on the Books we might easily perceive, that those sayings he has transcribed out of them, do not concern Representing but Disputing, and I never undertook to justifie every saying in Protestant Writers against Popery; but yet some things sounded so harsh, that I vehemently suspected foul play, and therefore had the curiosity to examine, and found it to be, as I suspected. Some passages for which they produce their Authorities, and that very good Authorities as the World went then, are cited by the Protester, without any Authorities, as he dealt before with the Archbishop; or what they prove by variety of reasons, is nakedly Represented without any reason to back it; or their words are curtailed, or transplaced, which alters their sense and signification. I shall give some few instances of this out of Mr. *Sutcliff*, to let the World judge, who are the Misrepresenters.

Quotations out of Mr. Sutcliff *in the* Papists Protesting, *&c.*

Mr. Sutcliff's Survey *of* Popery.

P. 12. THey speak what they can in disgrace of the Holy Scriptures.

FInally they say, they are obscure and hard to be understood, *they speak what they can in disgrace of the Holy Scriptures.* P. 6.

They give the Office of Christ's mediation to the Virgin *Mary*, to

They give the Office, &c. teaching that by their Merits Christians obtain

Angels and to Saints, they make alſo Saints our Redeemers.

They overthrow Grace, and aſcribe the merit of our Salvation not to Gods mercy through Chriſt, not to the merit of his Paſſion, but properly to our own Works and Merits.

They cut out the Second Commandment becauſe it cannot ſtand with the Popiſh worſhip of Images.

They pray before Stocks and Stones, nay they put their truſt in them.

Papiſts think they do God good ſervice, when they murder true Chriſtians.

By the Doctrine of Papiſts the Devils of Hell may be ſaved.

Papiſts blaſphemouſly make Chriſt not only a deſperate Man without hope, but alſo an Infidel without Faith. *p.* 13.

That Chriſt is not the Redeemer of all Mankind.

tain their deſires, and are delivered out of Purgatory. *Ibid.*

Albeit they exclude not Grace from the work of our Salvation, yet making Grace a Habit or Vertue, *they overthrow Grace*, &c. *p.* 9.

They cut out the Second Commandment in the Offices of our Lady and their Primers, *becauſe*, &c. *Ib.*

Nay they put their truſt in them: for if this were not ſo, why ſhould they hope for better ſucceſs at the Image of our Lady of *Loretto* or *Monſerat*, than at any other Image or form of our Lady? *p.* 10.

Proved from the cruel Executions in *England*, *France*, *Germany*, *Spain*. p. 23.

They teach, that the Devils of Hell may have true Faith, but our Saviour ſaith *John* 3. *that whoſoever believeth in him ſhall not periſh, but have everlaſting life.* So it followeth *by the Doctrine of Papiſts*, that the Reprobates, and *Devils in Hell may be ſaved.* p. 28.

They take from Chriſt both Faith and hope. *Aqui. p.* 3. *q.* 7. *art.* 4. So that which they falſely objected to *Calvin* doth rightly fall upon the Papiſts---*that they blaſphemouſly make Chriſt*, &c.

They affirm the Virgin *Mary* to be conceived without original Sin, *&c.* of which it follows, *that Chriſt is not the Redeemer of all Mankind*, for what needed they a Redeemer, who were not born ſinners? *p.* 41.

They make Chriſt inferiour to Saints and Angels.

They ſay Maſſes in honour of Angels and Saints, but he, in whoſe honour a Sacrifice is offered, is greater than the Sacrifice: doth it not then appear, that while they offer Chriſts Body and Blood in honour of Saints and Angels, *they make Chriſt inferior to Saints and Angels?* p. 42.

They prefer the Pope before Chriſt.

They prefer the Pope before Chriſt, for Chriſt's Body, when the Pope goeth in progreſs, is ſent before with the Baggage, and when the Pope is near, goeth out to meet him, while all the Gallants of *Rome* attend on the Pope. *p.* 43.

To the Images of the Croſs and Crucifix, they give as much honour as is due to God. *p.* 14.

To the Images, &c.—teaching their followers, that it is but one honour given to the Image, and the thing Repreſented by the Image. *p.* 74.

They fall down like Beaſts before the Pope, and worſhip him as God, aſcribing to him moſt blaſphemouſly the honour due to Chriſt.

They fall down, &c. *Paulus Æmilius l.* 2. telleth, how the Ambaſſadors of *Sicily* cried thus to the Pope, Thou that takeſt away the ſins of the World have mercy upon us.—*Stapleton* to *Greg.* 13. calls him *ſupremum numen in terris*: They call him Vicar of Chriſt, the Monarch of the Church, the Head, the Spouſe, the foundation of the Church, *aſcribing to him moſt blaſphemouſly the honour due to Chriſt. p.* 72.

They give divine honour to Images, which they themſelves cannot deny to be Idolatrous.

They confeſs it Idolatry to give divine honour to Creatures. But they give divine honour to the Sacament, to the Croſs, and to Images of the Trinity, which, I hope, they will not deny to be Creatures.

The

The Romiſh Church conſiſts of a Pack of Infidels. *p.* 15.

Faith is of things (as the Papiſts ſay in their Catechiſm) only propoſed to us by the Church; ſo that if the Church propoſe not to us the Articles of Faith, we are not to believe them, if theſe Men teach truth. Further this ſheweth, the *Romiſh Church conſiſts of a pack of Infidels*; for if the ſame believed not without the authority of the Church, then ſhe did believe nothing of Chriſt, ſeeing the Papiſts acknowledge no other Church but that of *Rome*, and no Church can teach it ſelf. *p.* 178.

Scripture and Fathers they read not.

Spoken of the Schoolmen (not of all Papiſts) upon the authority of *Ferdinando Velloſillo. p.* 200.

In a member of the Catholick Church (they ſay) neither inward Faith nor other virtue is required, but only that he profeſs outwardly the Romiſh Religion, and be ſubject to the Pope.

This Opinion he attributes to Cardinal *Bellarmin* and cites *de Eccleſ. milit. cap.* 2.

They make more Conſcience to abſtain from fleſh on *Friday*, than to murder Chriſtians.

They make more Conſcience, &c. as their curioſity in keeping the Faſt, and their cruelty in maſſacring Chriſtians declares. *p.* 205.

Divers points of Popiſh Doctrine are eſpecially ſaid to proceed from the Devil.

He inſtances in forbidding Marriage, and commanding to abſtain from meats, which he ſays are called in Scripture Doctrines of Devils. *p.* 213.

That *the Popiſh Church hath no true Biſhops*, that *Popery in many points is more abſurd and abominable than the Doctrine of* Mahomet: That *Papiſts, that poſitively hold the heretical and falſe Doctrines of the modern Church of* Rome, *cannot poſſibly be ſaved*, are the Titles of ſeveral Chapters, in which he endeavours to make good theſe charges, how well let our Author conſider; but all men will ſee, that this is not Repreſenting but Diſputing.

This

This is abundantly enough to give the Reader a taſt of the Proteſters honeſty in Repreſenting, and how little I am concerned in theſe Quotations. If ſome Proteſtants have charged the Doctrines and Practices of the Church of *Rome* with ſuch conſequences as they cannot juſtifie, wiſer Proteſtants diſown it, and Papiſts may confute it, if they pleaſe, which will be a little more to the purpoſe, than to cry out ſo Tragically about Miſrepreſenting.

But to make good this charge of Miſrepreſenting againſt us, he concludes with ſeveral paſſages out of the Homilies, concerning the worſhip of Saints and Images. Now if our Church be guilty of Miſrepreſenting in her very Homilies, which we are all bound to ſubſcribe, we muſt acknowledge our ſelves to be Miſrepreſenters. But wherein does the Miſrepreſentation conſiſt? Do they not ſet up Images in Churches? And do they not worſhip them? Have they not a great number of Saints, whom they worſhip with Divine Honours? The matter of fact is plain and confeſſed, and therefore our Church does not miſrepreſent them. So that the only Miſrepreſentation he can complain of, is, that he does not like the judgment of our Church about the worſhip of Saints and Images, and we cannot help that. This is the belief of our Church, and this is our belief, and let him prove us to be Miſrepreſenters in this, if he can; for that is not proved meerly by his calling it Miſrepreſenting.

Only I would gladly know of this Author, what he takes the judgment of the Church of *England* to be about the worſhip of Images? Whether it be Idolatry or not? If he thinks our Church charges them with Idolatry in worſhipping Images, (which I ſuppoſe he means when he complains of Miſrepreſentation, and picks out ſome paſſages, which look that way) there is the authority of Doctor *Godden* againſt him (unleſs he has changed his mind lately) who accuſes Dr. *St.* with contradicting the Church of *England* in his charge of Idolatry upon the Church of *Rome*, and makes it a certain mark of Fanaticiſm to do ſo: and then however we may be thought to miſrepreſent the Church of *Rome* in this charge of Idolatry, we do not miſrepreſent the Church of *England* in it, which is ſome ſatisfaction to us, that we are not Miſrepreſenters on both ſides. But theſe Men take great liberties in Repreſenting the Faith and Doctrines of Churches. In one Kings Reign the Church of *England* does not charge the Church of *Rome* with Idolatry, in the next it does; though their Articles and Homilies be the ſame ſtill: but they deal with the Church of *England* no worſe than they do with their own Church; in one Age a *Bellarmine* truly Repreſents the Doctrine of their Church, in another a Biſhop of *Condom*; and though the Council of *Trent* be but one

one and the ſame, the Faith of it alters very often, as it may beſt ſerve the intereſt of the Catholick Cauſe.

Our Author having expoſed *the Proteſtant Character* (as he calls it) *of a Papiſt, which he always looked upon no other, than of a Papiſt Miſrepreſented*, he falls a commending the zeal of Proteſtants againſt ſuch Popery with great earneſtneſs and paſſion, and therein we agree with him, as believing it to be very commendable; and do not doubt (as he ſays) but *thoſe Martyrs recorded by* Fox, *who for not embracing this Popery paſſed the fiery Tryal, had ſurely a glorious Cauſe, and that the Triumphs and Crowns of Glory, which waited for them in Heaven, were not inferior to what thoſe enjoyed, who ſuffered under* Decius *or* Diocleſian. I agree with him alſo, *that there is no need of any longer diſagreement, that there is no neceſſity of keeping up names of diviſion; that Proteſtant and Papiſt may now ſhake hands, and by one ſubſcription cloſe into a Body, and joyn in a fair and amicable correſpondence*: For if (as he ſays) there is no Papiſt, but will *give his hand for the utter ſuppreſſing this kind of Popery*, I ſee no reaſon, why they may not joyn in Communion with the Church of *England* which has ſuppreſſed it. But I am not of his mind, that all the Strife *has been about a word*; for the Diſpute has been about the Worſhip of Saints, and Images, about Tranſubſtantiation, worſhipping the Hoſt, Communion in one kind, Service in an unknown Tongue, the authority and the uſe of the Holy Scriptures, the Sacrament of Penance, Indulgences, Purgatory, the Popes Supremacy, and ſeveral other material differences; which are ſomething more than a meer Word; will they now part with all theſe Doctrines and Practices, *ſince they have been informed by great and good authorities*, what the nature and evil tendency of theſe things is? No! by no means, they will retain all theſe Doctrines and Practices ſtill, but will renounce and abhor all that evil, which Proteſtants charge them with. They will pray to Saints, and worſhip Images ſtill, but they will abhor all Heatheniſh Idolatry in ſuch Worſhip, *&c.* but what reaſon is this for Proteſtants to joyn with them in one Communion, while they retain the ſame Faith and Worſhip, which at firſt made a ſeparation neceſſary, and we retain the ſame opinion of their Faith and Worſhip, which ever we had? If Papiſts be the ſame, & Proteſtants the ſame, that ever they were, if Separation were once

Papiſts Proteſting, &c. p. 17.

P. 18.

once neceſſary, ſurely it is ſo ſtill. What change is there now in Papiſts, which was not before, that ſhould now invite us to embrace their Communion? Yes they abhor all that which Proteſtants call Popery. This is good news, but let us a little better underſtand it. Do they abhor the Worſhip of Saints and Images, and the Hoſt? Do they abhor the Doctrines of Tranſubſtantiation, Penances, Indulgences, Purgatory? Do they renounce the Popes Supremacy, *&c.* no ſuch matter! but they abhor thoſe Opinions, which Proteſtants have of theſe things; did they then ever believe that theſe Doctrines and Practices were ſo bad, as Proteſtants always did, and to this day, ſay they are? if not, what change is there in them, that ſhould invite us now to a reconciliation? Did Proteſtants ſeparate from Papiſts, becauſe they believed, that Papiſts thought Idolatry lawful? If not, why is their abhorring Idolatry, while they do the ſame things, that ever they did, a ſufficient reaſon for a re-union? Suppoſe ſome Common-wealths-men, who take up Arms againſt the King, ſhould tell the Royaliſts, who fight for him, that they have all this while miſtaken one another, that for their parts they hate Rebellion, as much as they can do, and have been greatly miſrepreſented by thoſe who have called them Rebels; *the ſtrife has been only about a word*, and therefore it is time for them now to joyn all together, not in their duty to their Prince, but in oppoſing him; though I dare not ſmile at our Author for fear of his diſpleaſure again, yet I fancy a good Subject would entertain ſuch a propoſal with a very diſdainful ſmile.

And therefore as for miſrepreſenting, our Author may complain on till he is a weary, but he can never prove us to be Miſrepreſenters, while they ſtill own that Faith and Worſhip, which we charge them with, and if he thinks we cenſure their Doctrine and Worſhip too ſeverely, let him vindicate it, when he can.

In my Reply I conſidered, what were the faults of his twofold Character of *a Papiſt miſrepreſented, and repreſented*, and ſhall now briefly examine, what he ſays to it.

As for the Character of a Papiſt miſrepreſented, I obſerved, 1. *That he put ſuch things into the Character, as no Man in his wits ever charged them with*: As *that Papiſts are not permitted*

to

to hear Sermons, which they are able to understand, or that they held it lawful to commit Idolatry; or that the Papist believes the Pope to be his great God, and to be far above all Angels, which the Answerer calls *Childish and wilful mistakes. And yet* (says the Protester, *p.* 19.) *those very things almost in express terms, and others far more absurd, we see charged on them, as is shewed above*; that is in the Quotations out of the Archbishop and others. But I can see no such thing, unless the *Supremum numen in terris* (as *Stapleton* calls *Greg.* 13.) signifie that the Pope is their great God, and then I must beg his pardon, that I did not think any Man in his wits so silly, as it seems some of their own great Divines have been, for this is not a Protestant, but a Popish representation of them.

2. I found fault, *That the Opinions of Protestants concerning Popish Doctrines and Practices, and those ill consequents which are charged and justly charged upon them, are put into the Character of a Papist misrepresented, as if they were his avowed Doctrine and Belief.* For whosoever gives a Character of a Papist, ought only to represent, what his Faith and Practice is, not what Opinion, he, who gives the Character, has of his Faith and Practice: for this does not belong to the Character of a Papist, but only signifies his own private Judgment, who gives the Character: while we charge Papists only with matter of Fact, what they believe and what they practise, this is a true Character, and no Misrepresenting; but if we put our own Opinions of his Faith and Practice into his Character, this is Misrepresenting, because a Papist has not the same Opinion of these things, which we have, and this makes it a false Character. Reply, *p.* 4.

To this the Protester answers *p.* 20. *This is a pretty speculative quarrel, I confess, and might deservedly find room here, were it our business to consider the due method of misrepresentation in the abstract: But as our present concern stands, here's a quaint conceit lost for coming in a wrong place. For what had the Author of the Misrepresentation to do with these Rules? He did not intend to misrepresent any Body.* This is very pleasant! a Man, who undertakes to make Characters, is not bound to consider, what a Character is, nor what belongs to representing, nor misrepresenting. Any Man would have thought so indeed, who had read his Characters, but I never expected, that he should have said so. But *he did not intend to misrepresent any Body*, and therefore had nothing to do with those Rules; but he intended, it seems, to give an account, how Papists are misrepresented by Protestants, and therefore ought to have understood, what is Misrepresenting, and not have called that Misrepresenting, which is not.

But *his Province* (he ſays) *was only to draw forth the Character of a Papiſt, as it is commonly apprehended by the Vulgar or the Multitude, with the common prejudices and miſtakes that generally attend ſuch a notion. Now I would fain know, whether this Character, as it lies in the Peoples heads, is diſtinguiſhed into antecedents and conſequents; whether they, when they hear one declaiming againſt Popery for committing Idolatry, as bad or worſe than that of the groſſeſt Heathens, worſhipping Stocks and Stones for Gods, diſtinguiſheth between the Doctrine of the Papiſts, and theſe interpretations and conſequences charged againſt it.*

P. 23. —— Thus in ſhort he tells us, *The Character of a Papiſt Miſrepreſented was intended only, as the Author expreſſes himſelf in his introduction, for a Copy of Popery as painted in the imagination of the Vulgar, and if it be conform to that, it is exact and perfect; and if there be any faults in it, the blame muſt fall on thoſe, who drew the Original.* This is the ſum of his excuſe for putting ſuch things into the Character of a Papiſt Miſrepreſented, as do not belong to Character-making, nor are in a ſtrict and proper ſenſe Miſrepreſentations. That the common People, who do not diſtinguiſh between Antecedents and Conſequents, have ſuch an idea and notion of a Papiſt, as he has deſcribed in the Character of a Papiſt Miſrepreſented. Well, ſuppoſe this, how does this mend the matter? If his Character of a Papiſt Miſrepreſented, be no miſrepreſentation, then our People, who have this notion of a Papiſt, are not Miſrepreſenters. Now this is that, which I undertook to prove in my Reply. That there is nothing of miſrepreſentation, properly ſo called, in his Character of a Papiſt Miſrepreſented; It is a falſe Character indeed, becauſe it contains ſuch things, as are not matters of Repreſentation, but of Diſpute, and therefore do not belong to a Character; but ſeparate matters of Fact from matters of Opinion and Diſpute, as I have particularly done in my Reply, and the Character of a Papiſt Miſrepreſented contains no matter of Fact, excepting ſome very few things, but what the Character of the Papiſt Repreſented owns. And therefore as far as it can be called a Character, it is a true one. And if this (as he ſays) *be a Copy of Popery as painted in the imagination of the Vulgar*, the Original can have no more of miſrepreſentation in it, than the Copy has.

But though the Proteſter does acknowledge, that there is a real difference between Repreſenting the Doctrines and Practices of Papiſts, and declaring our own Judgment and Opinion concerning them, he ſuſpects the People *do not diſtinguiſh between Antecedents and Conſequents, between the Doctrines of the Papiſts and theſe interpretations and conſequences charged on it.*

P. 29.

They

They ſwallow all down greedily in the lump, Antecedents and Conſequents go down with them all at once. But what does he mean by this? that any Proteſtant People are ſo ſilly as to think that Papiſts believe as bad of their own Religion, as they believe of it? That Papiſts believe Idolatry to be lawful, as he tells us in the Character of a Papiſt Miſrepreſented; or that they believe the Worſhip of an Image to be Idolatry? no, I aſſure him, our People are taught, what Popery is *in its genuine purity*, as he ſpeaks; they know in the moſt material points, what the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* is, and are taught, what to think of it; and when they hear or read our Diſputes againſt the Church of *Rome*, they are not ſo weak as to believe, that we and Papiſts have the ſame Opinions about Worſhipping Saints and Images, and the Hoſt, *&c.* and therefore are not in danger of affixing ſuch Opinions on Papiſts, as they hear us charge on Popery. So that this is a very needleſs fear he is in, and if nothing elſe hinders, he may (as he promiſes) reform his Character of a Papiſt Miſrepreſented.

I muſt confeſs we are pretty poſitive in declaring to our People the evil and danger of Popery. We tell them what we think of it, not as *thinking* ſignifies doubtfulneſs and uncertainty, but an aſſured perſwaſion founded on Reaſon, Scripture, and the beſt Authorities: as he complains, *that we go beyond thinking, and inſtead of ſaying we think ſo, we poſitively ſay, ſo it is.* P. 21. But if we are in the right, there is no hurt in this, and we ſhall believe ſo, till they can prove, that we are in the wrong; we do not indeed pretend to Infallibility, but we think our ſelves as certain, as thoſe who do.

This is the ſum of what he ſays in defence of his Character of a Papiſt Miſrepreſented, that though he acknowledges my diſtinction to be good between Matters of Diſpute and of Repreſentation; and conſequently that his Character of a Papiſt Miſrepreſented has nothing of miſrepreſentation in it, truly ſo called; yet he ſays, this is the Idea of a Papiſt, as it is commonly apprehended by the Vulgar, who do not diſtinguiſh between Antecedents and Conſequents, but whatever they hear ſaid of Popery, they take to be the Faith of a Papiſt, without diſtinguiſhing what it is the Papiſts own, and believe, and practiſe, and what guilt Proteſtants charge them with for thus believing and doing: that when they hear the Papiſts charged with Idolatry for Worſhipping Images, they as verily think, that Papiſts believe Idolatry to be lawful, as

they do, that they believe it lawful to Worſhip Images. If there be any among us ſo very ſilly, I dare ſay, they can neither Read nor Write, and therefore he might have ſpared his pains in writing and printing Characters for them; and if his Character of a Papiſt (as he ſays) be what he thought of a Papiſt, while he himſelf was a Proteſtant, it ſeems he was in a very low diſpenſation then, and could not himſelf *diſtinguiſh between Antecedents and Conſequents, but ſwallowed all down together*, though he is now improved into a Writer of Characters; and may they never have any wiſer Converts. However this does plainly yield the cauſe, that the Proteſtant Clergy, and underſtanding Gentry and Laity, who can diſtinguiſh between Antecedents and Conſequents, are no Miſrepreſenters; and as for others, we fear, they have a great many more Miſrepreſenters on their ſide, than we hope, we have on ours.

Let us now conſider his Character of a Papiſt Repreſented, and what the faults of that are. Now the general fault is, that whereas one might reaſonably expect, that there ſhould be ſome difference between the Character of a Papiſt Miſrepreſented, and of a Papiſt Repreſented, and he has endeavoured to make his Readers believe, that there is, yet in truth there is none in moſt parts of the Character. For what does ſtrictly belong to Repreſentation, that is, all matter of Fact, is the ſame in both. For, 1. He having put the Opinions of Proteſtants concerning Popiſh Doctrines and Practices into the Character of a Papiſt Miſrepreſented, as if they were his avowed Doctrine and Belief; in the Character of a Papiſt Repreſented he denies, that he believes thoſe Interpretations and Conſequences; and this he might very eaſily do, becauſe (as he obſerves, *p.* 24.) *no body charges him with that belief*; and whereas he ſays, *then he contradicts no Body, and he hopes there is no fault in that*, he is ſo far in the right; but his fault is, that he impoſes upon his Reader, with an appearance of a Miſrepreſentation, when there is none; and by his denying that they believe ſuch things, would perſwade the World, that Proteſtants charge Papiſts with believing all theſe ill things themſelves, which we ſay of their Faith and Worſhip; a ſign that he was hard put to it, to find out ſome Proteſtant Miſrepreſentations of Papiſts. And 2. As for matter of Fact, which alone is proper for a Character, *he generally owns the Doctrines and Practices we charge them with*; and his ſaying, *how could this poſſibly be otherwiſe, if they charge us with more, but what we expreſly*,

preſly profeſs to own (in which he reflects upon what I had ſaid in my Reply, that we charge them with believing nothing, but what they expreſly profeſs to believe) is nothing to the purpoſe; for it is not abſolutely *what we charge them with*, but what he himſelf makes us charge them with in his Character of a Papiſt Miſrepreſented, and calls us Miſrepreſenters for doing ſo, that he owns in the Character of a Papiſt Repreſented, as I particularly ſhewed in my Reply; now the queſtion is, why he calls one Character a Miſrepreſentation, and the other a Repreſentation, when the matter of Fact is the ſame in both?

But then (3.) I obſerved, *that in ſome caſes he diſowns that to be the doctrine and belief of their Church, which manifeſtly is ſo, and has been proved on them, beyond all poſſibility of a fair Reply, by the learned Anſwerer.* To which he Anſwers: *then for all his word, we are in ſome caſes charged with more than we expreſly profeſs to believe.* But he muſt know we do not take the profeſſion of the Roman Faith from every private Character-maker, but from the authentick Records of their Church; and if they deny what their Church teaches, and requires them to believe, it is not indeed their Faith, but yet it ought to be ſo: and though he may huff at *manifeſtly and proving*, I ſuſpect, he will take a little time before he brings it to the Tryal.

This is a ſufficient anſwer to his freſh complaint of Miſrepreſentations. I now proceed to the ſecond part of the Reply, The rule of true Repreſenting, or the Rule whereby the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* is to be known. He appealed to the Council of *Trent*, and the Catechiſm *ad Parochos*, and theſe I acknowledged to be authentick Rules; but ſince Catholick Divines differ about the ſenſe of the Council and Catechiſm, the queſtion is, Why we muſt prefer his ſenſe of the Council and Catechiſm before Cardinal *Bellarmin*'s, or any other Divines of Note and Eminency in the Church of *Rome*, who lived ſince the Council of *Trent*, and may be preſumed to underſtand the meaning of it, as well as the Repreſenter; and therefore to remove this difficulty in his Reflections he appealed to the Biſhop of *Condom*, as the Authentick Expoſitor of the Council and Catechiſm, and told us, how his Book had been approved by many Biſhops, and Cardinals, and by the preſent Pope himſelf, and therefore has the *authority of the See Apoſtolick*.

To this I anſwered in my Reply (*p.* 44.) that the atteſtation given to Cardinal *Bellarmin*'s Controverſies was not infe-

ſior to that given to the Biſhop of *Condom*'s Expoſition of the Doctrine of the Catholick Church; that it was Dedicated to Pope *Sixtus* 5. and that with the Popes leave and good liking, which is not much inferior to a teſtimonial under the Popes hand; and why then are not *Bellarmin*'s Controverſies as authentick a rule for the Expoſition of the Catholick Faith, as the Biſhop of *Condom*'s? But to this he thought fit to anſwer nothing.

And whereas he pretends that the Popes approbation gives it the authority of *the Apoſtolick See*: I acquainted him out of *Melchior Canus*; *That the name of the Apoſtolick See does not ſignifie the Pope in his private capacity, but in his Chair, or doing ſuch things, and in ſuch a manner, as belong to the Papal Chair, that is, not giving his own private ſenſe, but proceeding in Council with the advice of good and learned Men; and therefore that is not to be accounted the Judgment of the Apoſtolick See, which is given only by the Biſhop of* Rome, *privately, maliciouſly, and inconſiderately, or with the advice only of ſome few of his own mind, but what he determines upon a due examination of the thing, by the advice and Counſel of many wiſe Men.*

Pag. 5. To this the Proteſter anſwers *that it is only an ungrounded and ill-turned conſequence, that becauſe that is not to be accounted the judgment of the Apoſtolick See, which is given only by the Pope, privately, maliciouſly, and inconſiderately, or with the advice only of ſome few of his own mind, therefore this learned Prelates Expoſition of the Catholick Faith is to be thrown by, as of no Authority; ſo that our Replier has here concluded without any more ado, that the approbation of this Book was only given privately, maliciouſly, inconſiderately, or elſe with the advice only of ſome few of the Popes own mind, otherwiſe the Conſequence will not hold.* But I thought *Canus* had told us, what was neceſſary to make the Popes approbation the judgment of the Apoſtolick See, as well as what hinders it from being ſo. That the Pope muſt give judgment according to the due form and method of proceedings belonging to the Apoſtolick Chair, in full Council, after due examination, and with the advice of many wiſe Men. Now I only deſire to know, whether the Pope in a full Council of Cardinals, did give judgment *ex Cathedrâ*, that the Biſhop of *Condom*'s Book was a true Expoſition of the Catholick Faith; For if he did not, though the Pope and all his Cardinals ſhould ſingly for themſelves give their own private judgment and approbation of it, according to *Canus* his rule, it is

not

not the judgment of the Apoſtolick See; for it is a private judgment, whether it be malicious or not, which I was ſo far from *concluding without more ado*, that, as the Proteſter obſerves, I did not ſo much as tranſlate it, (though I put it in the Latine Quotation in the Margin, which is an argument I did not deſignedly conceal it) becauſe I thought it was needleſs to my purpoſe: and yet the Conſequence holds good without it, if it be not a judgment *ex Cathedrâ*, it is not the judgment of *the Apoſtolick See*, which was all I intended to prove; and our Author in his long harangue has ſaid nothing to prove that it was, nay is ſo far from that, that he avoided the very mentioning of that, becauſe he knew not what to ſay to it. *Malitiouſly* and *inconſiderately* were pretty words to deſcant upon, but the *Cathedra* choaked him.

The truth is the principal Commendation, which is given to the Biſhop of *Condom*'s Book, is, that it is a new way of dealing with Hereticks, and that which they hope may be more effectual than Diſputing has been; but there is none of them, that make it the Rule, much leſs the only Rule of the Catholick Faith. Cardinal *de Buillon* acquaints Cardinal *Bona*, *that there are ſome* (and he ſpeaks of Catholicks) *who find ſome fault in it*; and Cardinal *Sigiſmond Chigi* in his Letter to the Abbot of *Dangeau*, though he highly commends him, yet is far from allowing his Book to be the Standard of the Catholick Faith, or the Authentick interpretation of the Council of *Trent*, when he tells the Abbot, *certainly it was never his* (Condom's) *intention to give the interpretation of the Tenets of the Council, but only to deliver them in his Book rightly explicated, in ſuch ſort, that Hereticks may be convinced*: that is, he did not allow him to interpret the Council, but commends him for dealing with Hereticks in a new, and, as he thought, more advantageous method, than had been formerly uſed; and to this purpoſe the Pope commends him, *that his Expoſition of the Catholick Faith contains ſuch Doctrine, and is compoſed in ſuch a method, and with ſo much prudence, that it is thereby rendred proper to inſtruct the Readers clearly in few words, and to extort even from the unwilling, a confeſſion of the Catholick Faith.* Now to me this ſeems to fall very ſhort of making the Biſhops Expoſition the Authentick interpretation of the Council of *Trent*; that what ever the Biſhop of *Condom* ſays, is the ſenſe of the Council, muſt be acknowledged to be ſo, though other, as good Catholick Divines, as famous in their Generation,

Card. *Bona*'s Letter.

and

and whoſe Books have been received with as univerſal approbation, are of another mind; and which ſignifies a little with us Proteſtants, where the plain words and reaſon of the Council is againſt him.

I would deſire our Author to tell me, whether the Pope, when he approved the Biſhop of *Condom*'s Book, did at the ſame time condemn Cardinal *Bellarmin*'s, or thoſe other Divines and Schoolmen, who give ſuch a different explication of the Council of *Trent*, from what this Biſhop does; if he did not, what authority has he given to this Expoſition, more than any other Catholick Doctor may challenge? Why may we not, if we pleaſe, follow *Bellarmin*, or *Suarez*, or *Vaſquez*, or *Cajetan*, as well as *Condom*? Our Author thinks it the ſhorteſt and eaſieſt way to decide this Controverſie whether he have truly Repreſented the Faith of a Papiſt, by making an experiment: Thus he concluded his Reflections, *p.* 19. *Do but you, or any Friend for you* (though I did not know before, that the Church of *Rome* would admit Proxies in the profeſſion of our Faith) *give your aſſent to thoſe Articles of Faith, as I have Repreſented it, in the very form and manner as I have ſtated them, in that Character of a Papiſt Repreſented; and if upon your requeſt, you are not admitted into the Communion of the Roman Catholicks, and owned to believe aright in all thoſe points, I'le then confeſs, that I have abuſed the World, that my Repreſenting is Miſpreſenting the Faith of the Papiſt.* To this I anſwered in my Reply, *p.* 40. that I did believe that his Repreſentation was the Faith of a Papiſt, excepting what concerned the depoſing Doctrine, and ſome few other points, which I had before particularly remarked (not that this is the whole of what Papiſts believe, but that it is right as far as it goes) but we did not like his Faith ſo well, as he had Repreſented it, as to make the experiment. This I thought had been anſwer enough for any reaſonable Man, but in his Anſwer to the Reply, he is ſtill for new experiments, as being much eaſier than Diſputing, which he does not like, and now the trial is, *That if notwithſtanding my refuſal to admit the depoſing Doctrine, and the Popes Infallibility, but as ſtated by the Repreſenter* (that is, not as Articles of Faith) *I be not judged ſufficiently qualified as to theſe points, to be received into the Communion of the Roman Catholicks, then he will grant, that I have reaſon to charge the Repreſenter not to have done his part in theſe particulars*, that is, not to have truly Repreſented the Faith of a Papiſt.

Papiſts Proteſt. p. 29.

Now

Now in anſwer to this, I beg his leave, that I may take my turn too in making Propoſals, and I will do it very gravely, without the leaſt Smile, ſince I ſee he is offended at it, and that is this. Suppoſe I ſhould reſolve to be a thorough-paced Papiſt, and inſtead of aſſenting to his Repreſentation, ſhould rather chuſe that Repreſentation, which Cardinal *Bellarmine* has made of the Faith of a Papiſt, who does not mince the matter, as to worſhipping Images, and praying to Saints, and truſting in their aid and aſſiſtance, *&c.* who makes the Popes Infallibility and his Depoſing Power an Article of Faith; ſhould I be thought ſufficiently qualified, as to theſe Points (wherein the Cardinal expreſly contradicts and condemns our Authors, and the Biſhop of *Condom*'s Repreſentation) to be received into the Communion of Roman Catholicks? If I ſhould (and I will venture the Proteſtor to ſay, that I ſhould not) then if his Argument from Experience be good; it is plain, That Cardinal *Bellarmine* has made a true Repreſentation of the Roman Catholick Faith; and thus we have Experience for both ſides, for Cardinal *Bellarmine*, and for the Biſhop of *Condom*, and our Repreſenter; and yet it is ſomewhat ſtrange, they ſhould be all true Repreſenters, eſpecially in thoſe points, wherein they contradict each other.

This the Biſhop of *Condom* was aware of, and therefore concludes his Book with a Caution againſt it to thoſe, who ſhould think fit to anſwer it. *That it would be a quitting the deſign of this Treatiſe, to examine the different Methods which Catholick Divines make uſe of, to eſtabliſh or explicate the Doctrine of the Council of Trent, and the different Conſequences, which particular Doctors have drawn from it.* Which is a plain Confeſſion, that other *Catholick Divines* do not agree with him in this Method, nor allow of thoſe narrow Bounds, which he has ſet to the Catholick Faith; and therefore it was wiſely done of him to perſuade his Anſwerers, to take no notice of any ſuch Diſagreement, and it will be a great piece of Civility and good Breeding in them not to do it; but how other Catholick Divines will take this, I cannot tell. Condom's Expoſ. p. 51.

This is enough in all Conſcience concerning the Biſhop of *Condom*'s Authority, which I muſt ſtill ſay is *nothing*, when we ſpeak of an Authentick Rule of expounding the Catholick Faith, in which ſenſe our Author appeals to him; though we will allow him the Authority of a wiſe and prudent man, whoſe writings are publiſhed and approved by Publick Authority, as the writings of other Catholick Doctors are, which is all the Authority we Pro-

teſtants give to our beſt Writers; and therefore the Proteſter has no reaſon to complain (as he does p. 27.) of *an uneven kind of Juſtice and Reaſoning* in this matter, and whoever deſires a more particular account of the Biſhop of *Condom*'s Authority, and thoſe Glorious Teſtimonies which are given to his Book, if he be a reaſonable man, may find Satisfaction in the Preface to the late Anſwer to the Biſhop of *Condom*.

But the truth is, I know no reaſon there is for all this Diſpute. I told the Reflector before, that I did not like his Faith, though it were as he has repreſented it; ſhould we allow the Biſhop of *Condom*'s Expoſition, and his Character of a Papiſt repreſented, to contain the true Catholick Faith, and that this is the whole of what the Council of *Trent* has determined, yet I can never be of this Religion; and ſince he was not ſatisfied with my bare telling him ſo, I will now give him ſome Reaſons for it, and particularly ſhew him, what it is I diſlike in *Monſieur de Meaux* the late Biſhop of *Condom* his Expoſition of the Doctrine of the Church about the Object of Worſhip, Invocation of Saints, and worſhip of Images, and take the flouriſhes of his Introduction into the bargain. And I chuſe theſe Heads, becauſe theſe are the matters, wherein he principally appeals to the Biſhop of *Condom*, and about which only he has offered any thing like an Argument, in his anſwer to my Reply: And I am as glad to take any opportunity of uſeful Diſcourſe, as our Author ſeems cautious not to give any. And that neither he nor the Biſhop may have any occaſion of Quarrel, I ſhall obſerve the Directions the Biſhop has given to thoſe, who think fit to anſwer to his Treatiſe.

Condom's *Expoſ.* p. 51.

He tells us; *To urge any thing ſolid againſt this Treatiſe* (the Expoſition) *and which may come home to the point, it muſt be proved, that the Churches Faith is not here faithfully expounded, and that by Acts, which the ſame Church has obliged her ſelf to receive; or elſe it muſt be ſhewn, that this Explication leaves all the Objections in their full force, and all the diſputes untouched; or in fine it muſt be preciſely ſhewn, in what this Doctrine ſubverts the foundations of Faith.* As for the firſt of theſe, it is done already to my hand, in *the Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome truly repreſented, in anſwer to the Papiſt miſrepreſented and repreſented.* And he muſt be as bold a man, who will attempt to mend that Author, as who attempts to confute him. The other two I will have in my eye in examining, as far as I am now concerned, *Monſieur de Meaux* late

Biſhop

Bishop of *Condom* his Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church in matters of Controversie.

SECT. I.

The Design of this Treatise.

WEre it possible to reconcile the Differences between us and the Church of *Rome*, only by a fair Representation of matters in Controversie between us; I should think it an admirable Design; and this being all the Author professes to intend, I cannot but highly commend his good Meaning in it; whether he has shewn so much Skill and Judgment, in undertaking a Design in its own nature impracticable, I shall leave to the Reader to judge, when he has fairly heard both sides. Had I known no more of the matter, but that the Reformation was begun by men brought up in the Communion of the Church of *Rome*, and intimately acquainted with the Doctrines and Practices of that Church; that some of these Corruptions, both before and since, have been complained of by men of that Communion; that the Council of *Trent*, which was convened upon this occasion, condemns many Doctrines of the Reformers, as contrary to the Catholick Faith, and guilty of Heresie; that both before and after this Council, there have been many Volumes written, and many fine Disputes between Popish and Protestant Divines, who have been men of as great Learning and true Understanding in these matters, as any the Age has bred, who did all this while believe, that there was a real and substantial difference between them: I say, when I consider these things, I should not venture, for the reputation both of Papists and Protestants, especially of the Council of *Trent*, to say, That the Dispute has been only about Words; that Papists and Protestants, even the most Learned men among them, have mistaken each others Propositions; and that the only way to reconcile this Difference, is so to state the matter in dispute, that Papists and Protestants may understand each other. I doubt not, but fierce men on both sides, may have made this difference much wider than it is: but yet such a difference there is, as no Representing can cure, as I believe will appear by considering Particulars.

SECT. II.

Thoſe of the Reformed Religion acknowledge, that the Catholick Church embraces all the Fundamental Articles of the Chriſtian Religion.

THat the Church of *Rome* does profeſs to believe all the Principal and Fundamental Articles of Faith, as the Biſhop affirms, I readily grant; but yet ſhe may hold Fundamental Errors, and deſtroy that Faith ſhe profeſſes, by other Doctrines deſtructive of the true Catholick Faith. That this is poſſible, he cannot deny, for men may believe inconſiſtent Propoſitions; and the Deſign of his Book is ſo to explicate the peculiar Doctrines of the Church of *Rome*, as to reconcile them with the Fundamental Articles of Faith, which the Proteſtant Explication of Popiſh Doctrines contradicts and overthrows; which had been a very needleſs Undertaking, were it impoſſible for men, who believe all the Fundamental Articles of the Chriſtian Faith, to believe any thing contrary to it. He might then have ſpared his pains in vindicating and explaining particular Doctrines; for it had been evidence enough, that ſuch Doctrines and Practices do not overthrow any Fundamental Article of Faith, becauſe they are owned by that Church, which profeſſes to believe all Fundamental Articles.

And therefore I cannot well gueſs, what advantage he promiſed himſelf from this. We may ſafely grant, that the Church of *Rome* believes all Fundamental Articles, and yet charge her with ſuch Doctrines and Practices, as deſtroy and tear up Foundations.

He obſerves indeed from *M. Daille*, that we ought not to charge men with believing ſuch Conſequences, as they themſelves do formally reject; nor do we charge any ſuch thing upon the Church of *Rome*, but *M. Daille* never ſaid, that we may not charge mens Doctrines and Practices with ſuch Conſequences, as they, who teach theſe Doctrines, diſown; for *M. Daille* himſelf, in the place quoted by the Biſhop, charges the Opinion of the Lutherans, and of the Church of *Rome*, about the manner of Chriſt's Preſence in the Sacrament, *with inferring the deſtruction of the Humanity of Jeſus Chriſt*: and therefore the Biſhop concludes too much, when he

he infers; *It is then a certain Maxime eſtabliſhed amongſt them, that they muſt not in theſe caſes look upon the Conſequences, which may be drawn from a Doctrine, but purely upon what he propoſes and acknowledges, who teaches it.* But the uſe *M. Daille* makes of it, is only this. That when ſuch ill Conſequences, as mens Doctrines are juſtly chargeable with, have no ill influence upon Worſhip, or as he ſpeaks, *no poyſon* in them; if they diſown ſuch Conſequences, this ought not to break Chriſtian Communion. And therefore, though no man ought to be received into the Communion of the Church, who denies the Humanity of Jeſus Chriſt; yet the National Synod at *Charenton* admits Lutherans to the Holy Table; becauſe whatever might be inferred from their Doctrine, yet they expreſly owned the Humanity of Chriſt; and this Doctrinal Conſequence was a meer Speculative Error, which made no change at all in Acts of Worſhip; but when the Conſequences are not meerly ſpeculative, but practical, and do not ſo much concern, what other men believe, and think, as what we our ſelves are to do, as it is in the Worſhip of Saints and Images, and the Hoſt, *&c.* to ſay, that we muſt have no regard to Conſequences, if the Church diſowns them, is to ſay, that we muſt not conſider the nature and tendency of our Actions, nor what they are in Gods account, but only what the Church thinks of them: and therefore though we will not charge the Church of *Rome*, with believing any Conſequences, which ſhe diſowns; yet if her Doctrines and Practices corrupt the Chriſtian Faith and Worſhip, it is fit to charge her with ſuch Corruptions; and if the Charge be juſt, though ſhe diſown it, it will juſtifie our Separation from her Communion.

Pag. 4.

SECT. III.

Religious Worſhip is terminated in God alone.

THE account the Biſhop gives of *that Interior Adoration which is due to God alone*, is very ſound and Orthodox; *that it conſiſts principally in believing he is the Creator and Lord of all things, and in adhering to him with all the powers of our Soul, by Faith, Hope, and Charity, as to him alone, who can render us happy by the Communication of an infinite Good, which is himſelf.* But there are two things I except againſt in this Section, as not fairly ſtated: Firſt, concerning

Pag. 4.

cerning *the exteriour marks of Adoration.* Secondly, concerning *the terminating of Religious Worſhip.*

As for the firſt, he tells us: *This interiour Adoration, which we render unto God in Spirit and in Truth, has its exterior marks, of which the principal is Sacrifice, which cannot be offered to any but to God*: And with reſpect to the ſecond, he tells us; *The ſame Church teaches us, that all Religions Worſhip ought to terminate in God, as its neceſſary End; and that if the Honour, which ſhe renders to the Bleſſed Virgin, and to the Saints, may in ſome ſence be called Religious, it is for its neceſſary relation to God.*

The Biſhop very well knew, that this is the main Seat of the Controverſie between us, and had he intended by his Expoſition, to have put an end to our diſputes; he ſhould have taken a little more care about this Point; for as he has now ſtated it, he has left the matter juſt as he found it. We ſay, *that all Religious Worſhip ought not only to terminate in God, as its neceſſary End*; but that God is the ſole and immediate Object of all Religious Worſhip, and that we muſt worſhip none beſides him, as our Saviour expounds the Law. *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve*, Matth. 4. We have always denied any relative Worſhip to be due to Creatures; for to worſhip Creatures, is to make them Gods, and it is no honour to the Supreme God, to advance his own Creatures to divine Honours, to make more, though inferiour, Gods for God's ſake. We ſay, all external Acts of Religious Worſhip, are peculiar and appropriate to God, as well as Sacrifice; for ſince we muſt worſhip none but God, whatever can be called Religious Worſhip, muſt be given to none beſides him; and the Biſhop has not dealt plainly in this matter; he ſays, that Sacrifice can be offered to none but God, but he has not told us, what he thinks of other external Acts of Worſhip, whether they may be paid to ſome excellent Creatures: for ſince Sacrifice is not a natural but inſtituted Worſhip; if nothing but Sacrifice is peculiar to God, then all external natural Worſhip is common to God and Creatures, and then in the ſtate of nature, there could be no external and viſible Difference, between the worſhip of God and Creatures; nor had there been any under the Goſpel neither, had not Chriſt inſtituted his laſt Supper, which the Church of *Rome* has transformed into a Sacrifice of his natural Fleſh and Blood.

See a late Tract of the Object of Religious Worſhip.

Thus when he ſays, that all *Religious Worſhip ought to terminate in God, as its neceſſary end*, this ſeems to me an ambiguous Expreſſion

preſſion; for Worſhip properly terminates in the Object to which it is given; and in this ſenſe, If all Religious Worſhip muſt terminate in God, then all Religious Worſhip muſt be given to God, and to none elſe; which is the true Catholick Faith, that God is only to be worſhipped. But then what becomes of that Religious Worſhip which is given *to the Virgin Mary, and Saints, in relation to God*? Does not this Worſhip, which is given to them, terminate in them, and not in God? Are not they the immediate and proper Objects of that Worſhip, which is given to them? And does not the Object terminate the Worſhip? Is God the Object of that Worſhip, which they give to the Saints and Bleſſed Virgin? Then they either give that inferior Degree of Worſhip to God, which is proper for Creatures, which is an affront to his Majeſty and Greatneſs; or they give that Worſhip to Creatures, which is proper to God, which is Idolatry. Which plainly ſhews, that that Worſhip, which is given to Creatures, is terminated in thoſe Creatures to which it is given; and therefore if any degree of Religious Worſhip be given to Creatures, all Religious Worſhip does not terminate in God, as he ſaid it muſt; and if all Religious Worſhip muſt terminate in God, then no Religious Worſhip muſt be given to Creatures, as he grants it may, to the Virgin *Mary* and Saints.

Yes, you will ſay, that Worſhip, which is given to the Saints and Bleſſed Virgin, terminates in God, becauſe it is given them upon account of their Relation to God; but this is a great miſtake; their Relation to God can only ſerve, for a Reaſon why they are worſhipped; but cannot terminate that worſhip on God which is given to them; becauſe not God, but they themſelves are the Object, and the ultimate Object of that Worſhip, which is given to them.

Though we ſhould grant, that God is honoured by that Worſhip, which is given to ſome excellent Creatures, who are his Friends and Favourites, yet the Honour we do to God in this, is of a very different nature from that Worſhip, which we pay to Creatures; it does not conſiſt in this, that the worſhip we give to Creatures is terminated on God, for it is terminated upon thoſe Creatures whom we worſhip; but the Honour muſt conſiſt in the Reaſon of our worſhip, that we worſhip them for God's ſake: It is an honour to God by Interpretation and Conſequence, as we intend it for God's Honour, or as God is pleaſed to think himſelf honoured by it; but it is no act of Worſhip to God, and there-

therefore not terminated on him. The Worſhip can go no further than its proper Object, though the Reaſon of the Worſhip may: For there is a great deal of difference between an Object, and a Medium of Worſhip; a Medium of Worſhip, which is only a repreſentative Object, receives our Worſhip, but does not terminate it, but convey it to that Being it repreſents; becauſe it is worſhipped only in the place and ſtead of another, as it is in that Worſhip, which is given to the Images of Chriſt and the Saints; which ſome Divines of the Church of *Rome* tell us, is not terminated on the Images, but on Chriſt or the Saints repreſented by thoſe Images; but a proper Object of Worſhip, which receives worſhip in its own proper perſon, for whatſoever reaſon it is worſhipped, it terminates the Worſhip; the Worſhip, which is given to it, goes not beyond it ſelf, though the Reaſon of the Worſhip may reach farther, and be thought to reflect ſome Honour upon God, and to teſtifie our Love and Reverence for him, by that Worſhip we pay to thoſe, who are dear to him. So that if we do give Religious Worſhip to the Virgin *Mary* and Saints, ſuch Worſhip is terminated on them, and then all Religious Worſhip is not terminated on God, as he ſays the Church of *Rome* teaches it muſt be, which yet teaches alſo the worſhip of Saints and the Bleſſed Virgin. Methinks he ſhould have taken care, to have ſtated this matter a little plainer: For if he cannot reconcile the Doctrine and Practice of the Church together, I fear his Expoſition will rather increaſe than end Controverſies.

Thus how doubtfully does he ſpeak; *If the Honour ſhe renders to the Bleſſed Virgin and to the Saints, may, in ſome ſenſe, be called Religious, it is for its neceſſary Relation to God.* Why does he not tell us plainly, whether this Honour the Church of *Rome* gives to Saints and the Virgin be Religious, or not, and in what ſenſe it may be called Religious Honour? If he undertake to expound the Catholick Faith, why does he not do it? Why does he ſpeak ſo cautiouſly? As if he were afraid to own, what the Faith of the Church is in this point? Which yet is a very material one, and very neceſſary to be truly ſtated. Thus I can underſtand, how the Honour, which is given to Creatures, may have Relation to God, *viz.* becauſe we honour them for God's Sake, and upon account of their Relation to him; but I do not underſtand, how this relation to God, makes the Honour of Creatures a Religious Honour. For though we honour Creatures for God's Sake, yet the Honour we give to Creatures muſt be ſutable to their own Natures,

tures, and therefore not that Religious Honour, which is proper to God only: As when we honour a man for the ſake of our Father, or our Prince, we do not give him that Honour, which is proper to our Father, or our Prince, though we honour him for their Sakes. And therefore if the Church of *Rome* does give Religious Honour to any Creatures, it will not juſtifie her, in giving religious Honour to Creatures, that ſhe honours them for God's Sake; for Creatures are Creatures ſtill, though never ſo nearly related to God, and therefore not capable of Religious Honours.

So that I do not ſee, how this Explication, if it may be ſo called, takes off any Objection, that was ever made againſt the Church of *Rome*, about the Object of Religious Worſhip. For if *by all Religious Worſhip being terminated on God*, he means, that no other Being muſt be religiouſly worſhipped but only God; then this is an invincible Objection againſt that Religious Worſhip, which the Church of *Rome* gives to the Bleſſed Virgin, and to Saints and Angels. If he means by it, that Religious Worſhip may be given to other Beings beſides God, ſo it be all *terminated* in God, then all the other Objections, againſt worſhipping any other Being beſides God, are in full force ſtill, notwithſtanding his Explication: their Relation to God will not juſtifie the Religious Worſhip of Creatures, and it is contrary to all Senſe and Reaſon to ſay, That the Worſhip, which is given to Creatures, is terminated on God.

SECT. IV.

Invocation of Saints.

THere are two great Opinions againſt that Worſhip, which the Church of *Rome* gives to Saints departed, who now reign with Chriſt in Heaven, as the Council of *Trent* teaches. 1. That it is to give them that Religious Worſhip, which is due only to God. 2. That it makes them our Mediators and Interceſſors in Heaven, which is an Honour peculiar to Chriſt. Now *M. de Meaux*, and after him, the Author of the Character, think to remove theſe Objections, only by explaining the Doctrine of their Church about this matter; and I ſhall diſtinctly conſider, what they ſay to each of theſe.

1. As for the firſt, That in praying to Saints they do not give them that Worſhip, which is due only to God, they think is evi-

dent from hence, That the Council of *Trent* and the Catechiſm *ad Parochos* teaches them only, *to pray to Saints to pray for them*: The Biſhop takes great pains to prove this to be the ſenſe of the Pag. 6. Council, and therefore, *that in what terms ſoever thoſe Prayers, which we addreſs to Saints, are couched, the Intention of the Church, and of her Faithful, reduces them always to this Form.* Now I will not diſpute this matter at preſent, but refer my Reader to the *Anſwer to a Papiſt miſrepreſented.*

But let us ſuppoſe, that this is all the Church of *Rome* intends by it, that we ſhould only pray to the Saints to pray for us, what advantage can they make of this? Yes, ſays the Advertiſement before the Biſhops Expoſition, p. 12. *To pray to Saints only to pray for us, is a kind of Prayer, which by its own nature, is ſo far from being reſerved by an Independent Being to himſelf, it can never be addreſſed to him*: That is, we muſt never pray to God to pray for us; and therefore ſuch a Prayer is no part of that Worſhip, which is due to God. And he adds, *If this Form of Prayer, pray for us, diminiſhed the truſt we have in God, it would be no leſs condemnable to uſe it to the Living than to the Dead; and St.* Paul *would not have ſaid ſo often, Brethren, pray for us: the whole Scripture is full of Prayers of this nature.* Thus the Author of the Character, tells us. *Papiſt miſrepreſented*, p. 3. Ed. 2. *In this he does not at all neglect coming to God, or rob him of his honour, but directing all his Prayers up to him, and making him the ultimat Object of all his Petitions, He only deſires ſometimes the juſt on Earth, ſometimes thoſe in Heaven to joyn their Prayers to his, that ſo the number of Petitioners being increaſed, the Petition may find better acceptance in the ſight of God: and this is not to make them Gods, but only Petitioners to God: He having no hopes of obtaining any thing, but of God alone.*

This is the leaſt that can poſſibly be made of that Worſhip, they give to Saints, which is not reconcileable with their practice neither; and if it ſhould appear, that this (as little as it is thought to be) is to give that Worſhip to Creatures, which is due to God, they muſt e'en reject praying to Saints to pray for them, as they now do, truſting in their aid and aſſiſtances, and power to keep them.

Now I only ask, whether Prayer be not an Act of Religion, and a worſhip due to God? if it be not, why do they pray to God? if it be, then they give the worſhip of God to Saints, when they pray to them. For it is not ſo much, the matter of our Prayer, as the nature of Prayer, which makes it an Act of Religion. We may pray to God for thoſe things, which men can give, *viz.* Food

and

and Raiment, and yet theſe are as religious prayers, as when we ask ſuch things of God, as none can give but himſelf; and by the ſame reaſon, though we pray to Saints only to do that for us, which a creature can do, that is, only to pray to God for us; yet our very praying to them is an Act of religious worſhip, which is due only to God.

The truth is, I am ſo dull, that I cannot ſee, what makes theſe new Reformers of the Roman-Catholick Doctrine and Worſhip, ſo ſhy of owning any other *aid and aſſiſtance*, which they expect from the Saints, but only their Prayers for them: for this makes no alteration at all in the nature of that worſhip, they pay to them. For ſuppoſe the Saints in Heaven (who now reign with Chriſt, as the Council affirms) were intruſted with the Guardianſhip of men, and the care of Saints on Earth, as Cardinal *Bellarmine* expreſly ſays they are; might we not as lawfully pray to them to imploy that power, God has committed to them, for our good and happineſs, as to uſe their intereſt with God for us by their prayers? Does one exalt you more above the condition of creatures than the other? May we not beg our Friends on Earth, to relieve our wants and neceſſities, as well as to pray for us? And if begging the prayers of our Friends on Earth, will juſtifie our praying to the Saints in Heaven, to pray for us; our asking an Alms on Earth, will equally juſtifie our begging the aid and aſſiſtance, as well as prayers, of the Saints in Heaven; and then we are juſt where we were. And if ever there were any good Arguments againſt praying to Saints, they are all good ſtill, though they pray to Saints only to pray for them: which is my only buſineſs at preſent, to ſhew (according to the Biſhop's deſire) *that his Explication leaves all the Objections in full force, and all the Diſputes untouched.*

Bellarm. de ſanct. beatit. l. 1. c. 20. & c. 18.

So that ſetting aſide the matter of our prayers, or what it is we ask, which makes no alteration in this caſe, the inquiry is, Whether when we pray to Saints, we do not give that worſhip to them, which is peculiar and appropriate to God?

Now the Church of *Rome*, is ſo far from thinking ſuch prayers to be the peculiar worſhip due to God, that ſhe thinks it as innocent to pray to the Saints in Heaven to pray for us, as it is to deſire the prayers of our Chriſtian Brethren on Earth. The Biſhop ſays, *The Church in teaching us, that it is profitable to pray to Saints, teaches us to pray to them in the ſame ſpirit of Charity, and according to the ſame order of fraternal Society, which moves us to demand aſſiſtance of our Brethren living on Earth.* The Character to the ſame purpoſe

Pag. 6.

makes *our desiring sometimes the Saints on Earth, sometimes those in Heaven, to joyn their prayers with ours*, to be Actions of the very same nature, and equally lawful. This is the true Pinch of the Controversie, and here it is we part with the Church of *Rome*; that we think, there is some difference between speaking to our Christian Brethren on Earth, whom we see, and converse with, and praying to the Saints in Heaven, with all the external expressions of religious worship and adoration: The first is to converse with them as men; the second is such a manner of Address, as is proper only for a God.

To pray to Saints, is somewhat more than to desire our Christian Friends to pray for us; it is *Supplicitèr eos invocare*, as the Council of *Trent* speaks, to invoke them, or call on them, in the manner of Supplicants; so that this must be acknowledged a worship of the Saints; and then it must be either a civil or religious worship; and which of these two it is, must be known by the manner of paying it. And therefore when all the circumstances of worship are religious, we must acknowledge the worship to be religious too: Such as praying to them in religious Places, in Churches and Chappels, and at consecrated Altars with bended knees, and hands and eyes lifted up, in a very devout manner, when they see no body to speak to, or to receive their Addresses, unless it be the Image of the Saint they worship. Thus some Nations worship their Gods, but no People ever paid their civil respects to each other in this manner.

But as I observed in my Reply (*p.* 66.) *There is one infallible distinction between civil and religious worship, between the worship of God and men: That the worship of the invisible Inhabitants of the other World, has always been accounted religious worship. Civil respects are confined to this World, as all natural and civil Relations, which are the foundation of civil respects, are; but we have no intercourse with the other World, but what is religious. And therefore as the different kinds and degrees of civil honour, are distinguished by the Sight of the Object, to which they are paid, though the external acts and expressions are the same; as when men bow the body, and are uncovered, you know what kind of honour it is, by seeing who is present, whether their Father, their Friend, or their Prince, or some other Honourable Person: So the most certain mark of distinction between civil and religious worship is this, that the one relates to this World, the other to the invisible Inhabitants of the next.* In this last Paragraph the Protester says (*p.* 35.) *We have a Consequence and Comparison, and both so excellent in their kinds, that*

that if any better connexion can be found in them, then between the Monument *and the* May-pole, *it muſt be by one, who has found one trick more in Logick, than ever* Ariſtotle *knew.* Sometimes indeed *Ariſtotle's* Logick does not do ſuch feats, as one would expect; but a little natural Logick, called common ſenſe, would have ſhewed him the connexion. For I think, there is ſome ſence in ſaying, that as the different degrees of civil honour, though moſt of the external ſigns of honour be the ſame, ſuch as kneeling, bowing the body, uncovering the head, may yet be diſtinguiſhed by the preſence of the Object, to which it is paid; whether it be our Father, or our Prince: So though the external ſigns of civil and religious honour, are in many inſtances the ſame, yet civil and religious worſhip may be viſibly diſtinguiſhed, by the object to which it is given: For civil worſhip can belong only to the Inhabitants of this World; but whatever worſhip is given to the inviſible Inhabitants of the other World, is religious.

Now if this be ſo, then to pray to Saints, now they are removed out of this World into an inviſible ſtate, is to give religious worſhip to them; which makes a vaſt difference between praying to the Saints in Heaven to pray for us, and ſpeaking to our fellow-Chriſtians on Earth to pray for us.

The Proteſter is willing to grant, or at leaſt ſuppoſe, that the honour or worſhip, which is given to the inviſible Inhabitants of the other World, is religious worſhip; but ſtill he ſays, it remains to be proved, *that all religious reſpect and honour is ſo a divine honour, as to make a God of the thing, to which it is paid, at leaſt conſtructively*: This I think, is no hard matter to do; but I ſhall firſt conſider his Arguments againſt it, and all that he ſays, is, That if it be true, *it proves too much, and will bring my ſelf in for a ſhare* with them, in giving religious worſhip to creatures, and ſo making Gods of them, at leaſt conſtructively. He inſtances in that Cuſtom of *bowing to the Altar, or Communion Table*, as he calls it, and *bowing at the name of Jeſus*; but this ſhall be conſidered, when I come to the worſhip of Images. His other inſtances concern *that religious reſpect, which we allow due to ſacred places and things, and a religious decency to the bodies of Saints and Martyrs*; but what is this to a religious worſhip. The reſpect we ſhew to ſuch things and places, is no more than a civil reſpect, which conſiſts in a decent uſage, in ſeperating them from vile and common purpoſes; and it is called a religious reſpect, not from the nature of the reſpect, but from the reaſon, why we give it, *viz.* out of reverence

Papiſts Proteſt. p. 33.

to

to God, to whose worship they are seperated. Thus that love and honour we pay to a living Saint, though it rise no higher than the expressions of a civil respect, may be said to be religious, when we love and honour them for Gods sake; but this is an external denomination from the Cause and motive, not from the nature of the Act, and therefore cannot make Gods of them, because it is not religious worship; but to give proper religious worship to any Being, is to give it that worship, which is proper only to God, which is the only way to make any Being a God, which is not a God.

Now if this be a true notion, that all worship, which is given to the invisible Inhabitants of the other World, is religious worship, I will easily prove, that we must worship no other invisible Being, but God alone, and therefore cannot pray to Saints in Heaven, without giving the worship of God to them.

And my reason is this, Because God challenges all religious worship to himself; as our Saviour tells us, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve*, Matth. 4. It seems to me a very needless dispute, what is the peculiar and incommunicable Worship, which must be given to none but the Supreme God, when God has appropriated all Religious Worship to himself, whatever act of religious Worship God requires us to pay to himself, must be given to none else; and therefore if all worship paid to invisible Beings, be in its own Nature religious Worship, we must worship no Invisible Being, but only God. For if all Worship of Invisible Beings be religious, and God challenges all religious Worship to himself, then we must worship no Invisible Being but only God; for to worship any other Invisible Being, is to give religious Worship to that, which is not God.

But the Protester thinks I ought to have allowed, for the different *Kinds and Degrees of Religious, as well as Civil Honour*. Such I
Pag. 35. suppose as they call their *Latria* or *Dulia*, Supreme or Subordinate Absolute or Relative, Terminative or Transient Worship; but there is no place for these different Degrees and Distinctions of religious Worship, if we must worship no other Invisible Being, but only God; for if there be but one Object of religious Worship, there is no need to distinguish this Worship into different Kinds and Degrees, as Civil Worship is, which has very numerous and very different Objects. If we must give no Worship to any invisible Being besides God, it is ridiculous to dispute, what Degree of Worship we may lawfully give them, when we must give them none.

And it is a good Argument, that there are no different Kinds of Religious Worſhip; one which is Supreme and Soveraign, and due to the one Supreme God; other Inferiour and Subordinate Degrees of Worſhip, which may be paid to thoſe Excellent Spirits, which are very dear to God, and the Miniſters of his Providence; becauſe there are no external and viſible Signs, to diſtinguiſh between ſuch different Degrees of religious Worſhip. As Civil Worſhip is confined to the Inhabitants of this World, and is thereby diſtinguiſhed from religious Worſhip; ſo the Different Degrees of Civil Honour, though the External Signs and Expreſſions of it are the ſame, are diſtinguiſhed by the viſible Preſence of the Object to which it is paid; for when a man bows or uncovers his head, we know what kind of Honour it is, by conſidering the Relation, or the Quality, of the Perſon, to whom it is paid, whether he be a Father, a Prince, or a wiſe and good man. But if there were more Inviſible Beings than one to worſhip, though there might be different Degrees of Internal Honour and Worſhip paid to them, according to the different Apprehenſions men had of their ſeveral Degrees of Perfection; yet the External Signs of Worſhip muſt be the ſame in all. And thus there would be no viſible diſtinction, between the Worſhip of the Supreme God, and created Spirits, and Glorifyed Souls of dead men; and therefore if it be neceſſary to diſtinguiſh, between the Worſhip of God and Creatures, we muſt worſhip no Inviſible Being, but only the Supreme God.

The Proteſter propoſes ſome ways, whereby *the different kinds and degrees of Religious Worſhip may be diſtinguiſhed*; as *by the intention of the Giver*; but this is not a Viſible Diſtinction: For mens intentions are private to themſelves, and there is no difference in the Viſible Acts of Worſhip, to make ſuch a diſtinction, *or by ſome Viſible Repreſentation*; that is, by Images: This I grant, would make as viſible a Diſtinction between the Worſhip of God, and Chriſt, and the Virgin *Mary*, as the preſence of the perſon diſtinguiſhes the Kinds and Degrees of Civil Honour; for when we ſee, whoſe Image they worſhip, we may certainly tell what Being they direct their Worſhip to; but the fault of this is, that it is forbid by the Law of God; of which more in the next Section; or by *Determination of other Circumſtances*, but what theſe are, I cannot tell, and therefore can ſay nothing to it. p. 351

The Church of *Rome* indeed does appropriate the Sacrifice of the Maſs to God, as his peculiar Worſhip, which muſt not be given

to

to any other Being; and if this be ſo, then indeed we can certainly tell, when we ſee a Prieſt offering the Sacrifice of the Maſs, that he offers it to the Supreme God; but there are a great many other Acts of Worſhip, which we owe to God, beſides the Sacrifice of the Maſs, and in every Act of Worſhip, God ought to be viſibly diſtinguiſhed from Creatures; and yet if all the other External Acts of Worſhip be common to God, and Creatures, where is the diſtinction? And yet the Sacrifice of the Maſs can be offered only by the Prieſt, ſo that the whole Layety cannot perform any one Act of Worſhip to God, which is peculiar to him, and therefore can make no Viſible Diſtinction in their Worſhip between God and Creatures.

And yet the very Sacrifice of the Maſs, is not ſo appropriated to God in the Church of *Rome*, but that it is offered to God in Honour of the Saints. This the Biſhop of *Condom* (p. 7.) endeavours to excuſe by ſaying; *This Honour which we render them (the Saints) in Sacrificing, conſiſts in naming them in the Prayers we offer up to God, as his Faithful Servants, and in rendring him thanks for the Victories they have gained, and in humbly beſeeching him, that he would vouchſafe to favour us by their Interceſſion.*

See D. Stillingfleet's *defence of the diſcourſe concerning Idolatry* p. 216. &c.

Now it is very true, according to the Council of *Trent*, the Prieſt offers the Sacrifice only to God, but they do ſomewhat more than name the Saints in their Prayers, for they offer the Sacrifice in Honour to the Saints, as well as to God, which the Biſhop calls *to Honour the Memory of the Saints*: Now if Sacrifice be an Act of Honour and Worſhip to God, it ſounds very odly to worſhip or honour God for the Honour of his Saints, which ſeems to make God only the Medium of Worſhip to the Saints, who are the terminative object of it; and that the Saints are concerned in this Sacrifice appears from this, That by this Sacrifice they *implore the Interceſſion of the Saints*, that *thoſe whoſe Memories we celebrate on Earth, would vouchſafe to intercede for us in Heaven.* The Biſhop tranſlates *implorat* by *Demand*, for what reaſon I cannot tell; and makes this *Imploring* or *Beſeeching*, to refer to God, not to the Saints, whoſe Patronage, *Patrocinia*, and Interceſſion they pray, they would vouchſafe them, contrary to the plain Senſe of the Council, and I think to common Senſe too: For I do not well underſtand offering Sacrifice to God, that he may procure for us the Interceſſion of the Saints; for if he can be perſwaded to favour us ſo far, as to intercede with the Saints to be our Interceſſors, he may as well grant our Requeſts without their Interceſſion; and

yet

yet the Biſhop was very ſenſible, that if we offer up our Prayers to the Saints in the Sacrifice of the Maſs, it does inevitably entitle them to the Worſhip of that Sacrifice, which, they ſay, muſt be offered only to God. He alleadges indeed St. *Auſtin's* Authority, who underſtood nothing of this Myſtery of the Sacrifice of the Maſs, and how far he was from thinking of any thing of this Nature, is evident to any man, who conſults the place. *St.* Aug. *de civit. Dei* p. 8. c. 27.

But the Church of *Rome* (as the Biſhop obſerves *p.* 8.) has been charged by ſome of the Reformation, not only with giving the Worſhip of God to Creatures, when they pray to the Saints, but with attributing the Divine Perfections to them, ſuch as *a certain kind of Immenſity and Knowledge of the Secrets of hearts*; for if they be not preſent in all places, where they are worſhipped, how can they hear the Prayers, which are made to them at ſuch diſtant places at the ſame time? If they do not know our thoughts, how can they underſtand thoſe mental prayers, which are offered to them without words, only in our ſecret Thoughts and Deſires? for even ſuch Prayers are expreſly allowed by the Council, *voce vel mente*.

Now to this he anſwers very well, that though they believe the Saints do by one means or other know the Prayers, which are made to them, either *by the Miniſtry and Communication of Angels, or by a particular Revelation from God, or in his Divine Eſſence, in which all truth is compriſed, yet never any Catholick yet thought, the Saints knew our Neceſſities by their own power, no nor the deſires which move us to addreſs our ſecret Prayers to them. And to ſay a Creature may have a Knowledge of theſe things, by a light communicated to them by God, is not to elevate a Creature above his Condition.* This I grant and therefore do acknowledge, that they do not attribute the Divine perfections of Omniſcience and Omnipreſence to the Saints, either in thought or word, but yet actions have as natural a ſignification as words; and if we give them ſuch a worſhip, as naturally ſignifies Omniſcience and Omnipreſence, our worſhip attributes the incommunicable Perfections of God to them. For it is unnatural and abſurd to worſhip a Being, who is not preſent to receive our worſhip; to ſpeak to a Being, who does not, and cannot hear us; and ſince God has made us reaſonable Creatures, to underſtand what we do, and why, he interprets our Actions, as well as words and thoughts, according to their natural ſignification. And herein the natural evil of creature-worſhip conſiſts, That every act of religious worſhip does

naturally involve in it a Confeſſion of ſome excellency and perfection, which is above a created nature, and thereby (whatever the worſhipper thinks or intend) does attribute the incommunicable Glory of God to creatures.

If the Saints are not preſent in all places to hear thoſe Prayers which are made to them, and if they cannot hear in Heaven, what we ſay to them on Earth, *by their own Power*, then Prayer is a worſhip, which is not due to their nature, even in a glorified ſtate. For no Being can have a right to our Prayers, who cannot hear them; and though we ſhould grant, that God reveals our Prayers to them, yet to know by Revelation is not to hear. In this caſe all that can be reaſonable for us to do, is only ſecretly to deſire, that the Saints would Pray for us, which God can reveal to them, if he pleaſes, as well as our Prayers; but it can never be reaſonable to Pray to thoſe, who cannot hear us.

And if Prayer cannot be due to a created nature in its moſt exalted ſtate, becauſe no creature can be preſent in all places to hear our Prayers, then if it be a proper worſhip for Creatures, it muſt be ſo by a poſitive Inſtitution of God; but then they muſt ſhew an expreſs command for it, and when they can do that, we will diſpute the reaſon of the thing no longer.

And this is a manifeſt reaſon, why we ſhould worſhip no other inviſible Being beſides God, becauſe no other inviſible Being is capable of our Worſhip. God alone fills all places, and therefore may be worſhipped, though we do not ſee him, for he is preſent every where to hear our prayers; but we cannot know, that any Being, of a limited preſence, is preſent with us, unleſs we ſee it; and it is unnatural to pray to any Being, who is not preſent to hear us.

And though the Church of *Rome* does not directly and poſitively attribute any divine perfections to Saints, yet mankind are ſo naturally prone, to aſcribe a kind of Divinity to immortal and inviſible Spirits, that this is a ſufficient reaſon, why God ſhould not allow the worſhip of any inviſible Spirits. For after all that can be ſaid to the contrary, it is a mighty temptation to men, at leaſt to make inferior Deities of thoſe, to whom they conſtantly pay divine honours.

And though they do not attribute to Saints, a natural power to know our Thoughts, and to hear our Prayers, and to anſwer them: yet if this ſupernatural gift and power, whereby they do it, be as conſtant, and act as certainly as nature does, it is as great

great and adorable a perfection, as if it were natural: for ſince all created Excellencies are the gift of God, what mighty difference is there between a natural and ſupernatural perfection, or gift, if that which is ſupernatural, be as certain and laſting, and that which they can as conſtantly uſe, as that which is natural. As to take their own inſtance: Were the gift of Propheſie, which God beſtowed on ſome in former Ages, as conſtant and certain, as natural knowledge; that they could uſe this gift, whenever they pleaſed, and as conſtantly foretel things to come, as they could reaſon and diſcourſe; what difference would there be in this caſe, between a natural and ſupernatural knowledge of future things: truly no more but this; That a natural knowledge is a perfection, which God did originally beſtow upon our nature: ſupernatural knowledge is an additional Perfection, but yet upon this ſuppoſition, as inſeparably annexed to our natures, as natural knowledge, and always as ready for uſe as that; which I think, would make ſuch a Prophet as truly venerable, as if Propheſie were natural to him.

Thus it is in this preſent caſe. If the Saints know our prayers, by what means ſoever they do it, it muſt be as conſtant and laſting a gift, as if it were natural; that is, they muſt as certainly know when, and what we pray for, every time we pray, as if they were preſent to hear us. For if they do not always know our prayers, we can never know, when to pray, and can never have any ſecurity of their interceſſion for us; many thouſand *Ave Maries* may be every day loſt, and turn to no account; and if they do conſtantly know this by a ſupernatural gift, it is as glorious a perfection, as if this knowledge were natural. Mankind do not ſo critically diſtinguiſh between natural and ſupernatural gifts; in whomſoever theſe perfections are, they are divine, and ſuch creatures have a ſupernatural kind of Divinity annexed to their natures; they are made Gods, though not Gods by nature, which is as much as any people believe of their inferior Deities, who believe but one Supreme and Sovereign God, who is a God by nature.

And yet the Author of the Character of *a Papiſt repreſented*, gives ſome inſtances, which would perſwade us, that the Saints have a natural knowledge of our Prayers. Thus he tells us, *That* Abraham *heard the petitions of* Dives, *who was yet at a greater diſtance, even in Hell, and told him likewiſe his manner of living, while as yet on Earth,* (p. 4.) Now not to ask, how

he comes ſo exactly to know, where Hell is, and that it is at a greater diſtance from Heaven, than the Earth is: If there be any force in this Argument, it muſt prove, that the Saints have a natural knowledge of our Prayers, though at ſo great a diſtance from us, as Heaven is: That they ſee, and hear us, as *Abraham* did *Dives*, though we cannot ſee and hear them, as *Dives* did *Abraham*; which might have ſatisfied him, ſince he thinks fit to reaſon from Parables, that whatſoever diſtance there is between Heaven and Hell, there is a greater communication between them, than between Heaven and Earth. However our Saviour cannot here ſpeak of any ſupernatural gift, whereby *Abraham* ſaw and heard *Dives* in Hell; unleſs we will ſay, that *Dives* did by a ſupernatural gift alſo, ſee and hear *Abraham* in Heaven; and therefore if this prove any thing, it proves, that Saints know and hear our Prayers by their own natural powers.

Thus he adds, *That the very Devils hear thoſe deſperate wretches, who call on them; and why then ſhould he doubt, that Saints want this priviledge in ſome manner granted to ſinful men and wicked ſpirits.* But though he call this a Priviledge, I ſuppoſe, he means a natural one, unleſs he thinks, that the Devils hear witches by a ſupernatural revelation, as the Saints in Heaven hear the prayers of the Saints on Earth: But I always thought, that Devils had been a little nearer bad men, than the Saints in Heaven are to us on Earth; for they are confined to this Lower Region, and therefore are often ſo near, as to ſee and hear bad men, though they are inviſible themſelves: And this is one reaſon, why God will not allow us to worſhip any inviſible Spirits, becauſe though we ſhould intend only to worſhip good Spirits, and glorified Saints, yet bad Spirits, who are near and preſent, as having their reſidence in the Air, as the Devil is called the Prince of the Power of the Air, do aſſume this worſhip to themſelves, and both corrupt the worſhip, and abuſe their Votaries, with lying Wonders. Thus they did in the times of Paganiſm, and whether they have more reverence for the Chriſtian Saints, than they had for the Pagan Deities, in aſſuming their names and worſhip, let others conſider.

But to return to the Biſhop. He having aſſured us, that the Church of *Rome* does not aſcribe any divine perfections to the Saints (of which the Reader may judge by what I have already diſcourſed) he thus concludes. *It is therefore true, that by examining what are our interiour Sentiments concerning the Saints, it will*

will be found we do not raiſe them above the condition of creatures, and from thence we ought to judge, of what nature that exteriour honour is, which we render them; exteriour Veneration being eſtabliſhed to teſtifie the interior Sentiments of the mind: That is, we muſt conclude, they do not give the worſhip of God to them, becauſe they do not believe them to be Gods. Now this, I confeſs, would be true, were the external Signs of honour wholly arbitrary, and at our own choice; for then they could ſignifie no more, than what we intend to ſignifie by them, and we ought not to be charged with intending to ſignifie more, than what we profeſs to intend; but when either the Act of worſhip naturally ſignifies divine perfections, as prayer to an Inviſible Being does, or God has reſerved any Acts of worſhip to himſelf, as he has done all Religious Worſhip, that is, all Worſhip paid to Inviſible Beings, as I have already ſhewn; in theſe caſes we may be guilty of giving divine honours to creatures, though in words and intention, we aſcribe no divine perfections to them. Pag. 9.

So that I cannot ſee, but that, after all the fine colours, and ſoft interpretations, which the Biſhop puts upon this practice of the Church of *Rome*, in praying to Saints, the charge againſt them of giving the peculiar worſhip of God to creatures, is as ſtrong and forcible as ever.

Secondly, let us now conſider, whether our praying to the Saints, to pray and intercede for us, be not injurious to the Merits and Mediation of Chriſt. Now there are two things the Biſhop urges to prove, that the Mediation of Saints is not injurious to the Mediation of Chriſt. 1. *That if the quality of Mediator, which the Scriptures gives to Jeſus Chriſt, received any prejudice from the Interceſſion made to the Saints, who raign with God, it would receive no leſs from the interceſſion made to the Faithful who live with us.* For this he alledges the Authority of the Catechiſm *ad Parochos*, which tells us, *That if it were not lawful to deſire help of the Saints, becauſe we have one Patron or Mediator Jeſus Chriſt, the Apoſtle would not ſo earneſtly have deſired the Prayers of the Brethren, who were then living, to God for him. For the glory and dignity of Chriſt, as Mediator, is not leſs diminiſhed by the Prayers of the Living, than by the Interceſſion of Saints in Heaven.* Pag. 6.

Nam ſi propterea Subſidiis ſanctorum uti non liceat, quod unum patronum habemus Jeſum Chriſtum, nunquam id commiſiſſet Apoſtolus, ut ſe Deo tanto ſtudio fratrum viventium precibus adjuvari vellet; neq; enim minus vivorum preces, quam eorum, qui in Cœlis ſunt, ſanctorum deprecatio, Chriſti Mediatoris gloriam & dignitatem imminuerent. *Catech. Rom. part.* 3. *Tit. de cultu & vener. ſanct.*

This

This is the leaſt that can be made of it, that the Mediation and Interceſſion of the Saints for us in Heaven, is no more than one Chriſtians praying for another on Earth; and I fear this is not reconcileable with the practice of the Church of *Rome* in this matter. For can this (if it be no more) be thought a ſufficient foundation, for all that pompous worſhip of the Virgin *Mary*, and other powerful Saints? Is this a good reaſon to erect Temples and Altars, conſecrated not only to their Memory, but to their Honour; to ſet up their Images in Holy Places, and pay our humble Adorations before them; becauſe they pray for us in Heaven, juſt as Chriſtian Brethren pray for one another on Earth?

And therefore I muſt needs ſay, the Biſhop has not truly expounded the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* in this Point, which makes the Saints to be *our Mediators in Heaven*; not indeed Mediators of Redemption, which ſhe acknowledges none to be but Chriſt, who has purchaſed us with his own Blood; but Mediators of Interceſſion, who have ſo much intereſt, and favour, in the Court of Heaven, as powerfully to recommend thoſe to God, who put themſelves under their Patronage. This I confeſs makes a great difference between the Mediation of Chriſt, and of the Saints, and yet leaves a great diſtance between the Prayers of Saints in Heaven for us, and the mutual Interceſſions of Chriſtians for each other on Earth, and the Church of *Rome* never taught, that they were of the ſame nature; for though the Catechiſm endeavours to prove, that the Mediation and Interceſſion of the Saints in Heaven for us, is not injurious to the Mediation of Chriſt; becauſe the Prayers of Chriſtians for each other on Earth, are very reconcileable with the Honour of Chriſt's Interceſſion: yet it never teaches, that there is no difference between the Prayers of Saints in Heaven, and Chriſtians on Earth; and I think we ought to diſtinguiſh, between the Doctrine and the Arguments of the Church. What ſhe declares to be her Doctrine we muſt own to be ſo, but I think we muſt not grant every thing to be her Do- makes which ought to be ſuppoſed to make her Arguments good; becauſe there is no neceſſity of granting, that all her Arguments muſt be good.

This Argument indeed, that the interceſſion of the Saints in Heaven, is no more injurious to the Mediation of Chriſt, than the Prayers and Interceſſions of the Saints on Earth for each other, cannot be good without ſuppoſing, that the Interceſſions of the Saints in Heaven are of the very ſame nature, with the Prayers

ers of Christians for each other on Earth; and the Bishop takes the advantage to represent this as the Doctrine of the Church, that *she teaches us to pray to Saints in the same spirit of Charity, and according to the same order of fraternal society, which moves us to demand assistance of our Brethren living upon Earth.* But this I think is not reconcileable with the expres words of the Council of *Trent*, which founds the invocation of Saints upon their *reigning with Christ*; which makes a vast difference between their interest and authority in the Court of Heaven, and the humble supplications of Christians on Earth. And I think *the spirit of Charity, and the order of fraternal society*, does not require us *supplicitèr invocare*, to pray to our fellow Christians on Earth *as humble Supplicants* to pray for us, as the Council teaches us to address our selves to the Saints in Heaven.

Christians indeed on Earth, and Saints in Heaven (since the Bishop has limited all their aid and assistance to their prayers) can do no more than pray for us; and are thus both of them distinguished from Christ, who is our Mediator of Redemption, who has bought us with his blood: But then we ought to consider, that there is a vast difference in prayers, and prayers may prevail upon such different Reasons, as may quite alter the nature of the Intercession. For is there no difference between the power and interest of a favourite, to obtain what he desires of his Prince, and the Petition of an ordinary Subject? A Prince may grant the Petition of a Subject for himself, or of one Subject for another, where there is reason and equity in the case, without any more powerful intercession; but acts of grace and favour must be dispensed by the intercessions of favourites; and yet it is all by way of prayer and Petition to the Prince; but though it is all but Petition and request, yet those who have any request to make to their Prince, place more confidence in the interest and power of one favourite, than in the joynt Petitions of many ordinary Subjects.

Thus it is here; Christians on Earth pray for each other as common Supplicants, and the benefit they expect from such Prayers and Intercessions, is only from the prevalency of Faith and Charity, which inspire such prayers, and make them efficacious. God has commanded us to pray for one another, and has promised to hear our united, fervent, and importunate Prayers, for the merits of our common Saviour Jesus Christ: But those who pray to Saints in Heaven, pray to them as Favourites and Mediators, who prevail not meerly by the force and efficacy of Prayer, but

by

by their perſonal Merits and Intereſts with God; and this makes them juſt ſuch Mediators as Chriſt is, who by their Power and Intereſt can recommend us and our Prayers to God's acceptance. No you'll ſay, Chriſt purchaſed us with his Blood, and mediates in the vertue of his Sacrifice, which makes his Mediation of a different nature from the Mediation of Saints, who mediate only by their intereſt with God, upon account of their perſonal Merits. But this alters not the caſe; for the general notion of a Mediator, is one who has Power and Intereſt with God, effectually to recommend us to his favour; and whether he mediates with, or without a Sacrifice, if his Mediation be powerful and efficacious, he is a true and proper Mediator; and to ſet up ſuch other Mediators beſides Chriſt, muſt be injurious to his Mediation, for then Chriſt is not our only Mediator; and after all the Apologies that can be made for it, it argues ſome diſtruſt, either of Chriſt's Power, or good Will to help us, when we fly to other Patrons and Advocates.

2. And therefore *Monſieur de Meaux* has another Reſerve; for in the ſecond place he tells us from the Council of *Trent*, *That to invocate Saints, according to the ſenſe of this Council, is to have recourſe to their Prayers, for obtaining benefits from God through Jeſus Chriſt, ſo that in reality we do not obtain thoſe benefits, which we receive by the Interceſſion of the Saints, otherwiſe than through Jeſus Chriſt, and in his Name; ſeeing theſe Saints themſelves pray in no other manner than through Jeſus Chriſt, and are not heard but in his Name. After which we cannot imagine, that any one ſhould accuſe us of forſaking Jeſus Chriſt, when we beſeech his Members, who are alſo ours, his Children, who are our Brethren, and his Saints, who are our firſt-fruits, to pray with us, and for us, to our common Maſter, in the name of our common Mediator.*

As for *forſaking Jeſus Chriſt*, this we do not charge them with; tho whoever conſiders, how much more frequent addreſſes are made in the Church of *Rome* to the Virgin *Mary*, and ſome other powerful Saints, than to Chriſt himſelf, will be tempted to think, that it looks very like forſaking him; but we only ſay, that they rob Chriſt of the glory of being our only Mediator and Advocate, by having recourſe to the Prayers, and interceſſions of ſo many Saints.

But how can the Interceſſion of Saints be injurious to the Mediation of Chriſt, when they themſelves intercede in the Name and Mediation of Chriſt; which neceſſarily reſerves to Chriſt

the

the glory of his Mediation entire, ſince the Saints themſelves *are not heard but in his Name*?

Now rightly to underſtand this, we muſt conſider the Nature of Chriſts Mediation, which is to offer up all thoſe Prayers to God in Heaven, which we make to God in his name on Earth. He is our Mediator in Heaven, *our High-Prieſt, who is paſſed into the Heavens; who is made not after the law of a Carnal Commandment, but after the power of an endleſs life, who is made higher than the Heavens, who is not entred into the Holy Place made with hands, which are the figures of the true, but into Heaven it ſelf, now to appear in the preſence of God for us.* So that as the High-Prieſt under the Law entred once a year into the Holy Place, which was a type and figure of Heaven, to make expiation and interceſſions for the People; ſo the Office of Chriſt, as our High-Prieſt and Mediator, is to aſcend into Heaven with his own Blood, and there to appear in the preſence of God for us. His mediatory Office is confined to Heaven; there he preſents our Prayers to God, in vertue of his own Blood; and this is as peculiar and appropriated to him, as it was to the High-Prieſt under the Law, to offer the Blood of the Sacrifice, and make Attonement, and Interceſſion in the Holy of Holies.

Heb. 4. 14. Heb. 7. 16. 26. Heb. 9. 24.

So that to preſent our Prayers to God in Heaven is the peculiar office of Chriſt, who is our great High-Prieſt, and only Mediator in the immediate preſence of God in Heaven; and to apply our ſelves to any other Mediators in Heaven, to preſent our Prayers to God, in what manner, or upon what pretence ſoever it be, is injurious to the Mediation of Chriſt, whoſe proper Office it is to preſent our Prayers to God in Heaven. And that pretence that the Saints pray for us only in the Name and Mediation of Chriſt, is no Apology in this caſe, for in what name ſoever they pray, they offer up our Prayers to God immediately in Heaven, which is the Office of our great High-Prieſt, for there is and muſt be but be but one Mediator in Heaven.

And if we conſider, what is meant by Praying to God in the Name and Mediation of Chriſt, we ſhall ſee reaſon to think, that this is very improperly attributed to the Saints in Heaven. For when we pray to God in the Name of Chriſt, though we addreſs our Prayers immediately to God, yet God does not receive them, as coming immediately from us, but as preſented by the hands of our Mediator; which is the true meaning of Praying to God in the Name of Chriſt, that we offer our Prayers to God, not di-

rectly from our ſelves, for then we ſhould have no need of a Mediator, but by his Hands, whoſe Office it is to preſent them to God, to appear in the Preſence of God for us, which is therefore called *coming to God by him.*

Heb. 7. 25.

Now this is very agreeable to the ſtate and condition of Chriſtians on Earth, who are at a great diſtance from the immediate Throne and Preſence of God, to offer their Prayers by the hands of a Mediator, who appears in the preſence of God for them; and the reaſon, why we want a Mediator to appear for us, is becauſe we are not yet admitted into God's immediate Preſence our ſelves. But could every ordinary Prieſt, or *Jew*, have been admitted into the Holy of Holies, as the High-Prieſt was, they might as well have offered their Prayers and Sacrifices there immediately to God, without the Miniſtry and Mediation of the High-Prieſt; and thoſe who are in Heaven in the immediate preſence of God, if they offer up any Prayers to God for themſelves or others, they offer them immediately and directly to God, becauſe they offer them to God in his immediate Preſence; which is the true notion of Chriſt's Mediation, that he appears in the preſence of God for us: And therefore whatever uſe there may be of the Name of Chriſt in Heaven; Saints in Heaven, who live in the immediate Preſence of God, have no need of a Mediator to offer their Prayers to God, as Saints on Earth have, becauſe they are admitted to the immediate Viſion of God themſelves. To offer up our Prayers to God, in the Name and Mediation of Chriſt, ſuppoſes, that we are at a diſtance from God, and not admitted into his Preſence to ſpeak for our ſelves; but thoſe Prayers, which are offered to God in his immediate Preſence, need no Mediator to preſent them. And yet to ſay, that the Saints in Heaven offer their Prayers to God in the Name and Mediation of Chriſt, is to ſay, that when they are admitted to the immediate Preſence of God themſelves, they ſtill need a Mediator; that the Prayers they offer to God, in his immediate Preſence, they do not offer immediately to him, but by the hands of a Mediator; which if it be Sence, I am ſure, is no good Divinity, as neither agreeing with the Types of the Law, nor with the Goſpel-account of Chriſt's Mediation. And therefore if glorified Saints appear for us in the preſence of God in Heaven, they are as much our Mediators as Chriſt is; for this is the moſt eſſential Character of this Mediation, that *he appears in the preſence of God for us.* The only Objection I can fore-ſee againſt this, is, that ſome of the ancient Fathers, though they did

not

not pray to Saints to pray for them, yet were inclined to believe, that Saints departed did Pray for the Church on Earth, eſpecially for their particular Friends, which they left behind them, and therefore to be ſure did not think this any injury to the Mediation of Chriſt. But then we muſt conſider, that as they ſpoke doubtfully of this matter, ſo thoſe very Fathers did not believe, that Saints departed were received up into the higheſt Heaven, into the immediate Preſence and Throne of God; though they thought them in a very happy ſtate, yet not perfect, till the reſurrection; and therefore they prayed for Saints departed, as well as believed, that Saints departed prayed for them. Now any Mediation and Interceſſion on this ſide Heaven, is very conſiſtent with the Mediation of Chriſt in Heaven; but to intercede in Heaven is his peculiar Office, which no other Creature can ſhare in, ſince his Reſurrection and Aſcenſion. This, I think, is ſufficient to prove, that *Monſieur de Meaux* his Expoſition cannot reconcile *Praying to Saints to Pray for us*, either with the peculiar Worſhip of God, or with the Glory and Dignity of our great and only Mediator *and Advocate Jeſus Chriſt*.

The Character of a Papiſt Repreſented.

3. *Of addreſſing more Supplications to the Virgin* Mary *than to Chriſt.* Pag. 4.

Monſieur de Meaux takes no notice of that peculiar kind of Worſhip, which is paid in the Church of *Rome* to the Virgin *Mary*, as being ſenſible how hard it is to reconcile this with his bare *Ora pro nobis*; but the Repreſenter, who pretends to follow the Biſhops Pattern, but wants his Judgment and Caution to manage it, undertakes to Apologize for this too; and it is worth the while to conſider what he ſays.

The Papiſt Miſ-repreſented is ſaid *to believe the Virgin* Mary, *to be much more powerful in Heaven than Chriſt, and that ſhe can command him to do, what ſhe thinks good, and for this reaſon he Honours her, much more then he does her Son, or God the Father, for one Prayer he ſays to God, ſaying ten to the Holy Virgin.* Let us then conſider how much of Miſ-repreſentation there is in this; and I ſhall begin with the laſt firſt, becauſe mens Actions are the beſt Interpreters of their Thoughts and Belief.

The Papiſt *for one prayer he ſays to God, ſays ten to the Virgin* Mary: Is this miſ-repreſented? Let him but tell over his Beads.

and ſee how many *Ave Maries* and *Pater noſters* he will find upon a ſtring, which are exactly ten for one. This he confeſſes, and thinks it as innocent to recite the Angelical Salutation now, as it was for the Angel *Gabriel* and *Elizabeth* to do it. But did the Angel uſe it as a Prayer to the Virgin *Mary? Is Hail thou that art Highly favoured, the Lord is with Thee, bleſſed art thou amongſt Women*, when ſpoken to the Virgin, who was then preſent to hear it, a friendly Salutation, or a Prayer? Was it delivering a Meſſage, or an act of Devotion? Or is this the *Ave Maria* now in uſe in the Church of *Rome?* As I remember, there are two or three little words, *Ora pro nobis*, added to it, which make it a Prayer, not the Angelical Salutation: And we do not read, that the Angel ſaid, *Holy* Mary, *Mother of God, pray for us ſinners, now and in the hour of Death.*

Contemplations on the life and Glory of holy Mary p. 24.

Indeed were it lawful to pray to the Virgin *Mary*, I ſhould have leſs to ſay againſt the frequent repetition of this prayer; but yet a man might enquire, why the prayer to the Virgin *Mary*, is repeated ſo much oftner than the prayer to God; is not this *to honour her much more then he does her Son, or God the Father?* For is not Prayer an act of Honour and Worſhip? And do we not then honour that Being moſt, to whom we pray oftneſt? No, ſays the Repreſenter, for he does not *at any time ſay even ſo much as one Prayer to her, but what is directed more principally to God.* Surely there muſt be ſome Myſtery in this. For do they not ſay a great many Prayers, immediately directed to the Virgin *Mary*, and not at all directed to God? Is not their *Ave Maria* ſuch a Prayer, and do they *principally* pray to God in thoſe Prayers, which are immediately directed to the Virgin *Mary?* When they pray to the Virgin *Mary to pray to them*, is this Prayer *principally* directed to God Almighty? What when the Virgin is only named; And the matter of the Prayer is ſuch, that it cannot be directed to God Almighty, unleſs they think it proper to pray to God to pray for them? Yes, theſe Prayers to the Virgin are *offered up as a thankful Memorial of Chriſt's Incarnation, and an acknowledgement of the Bleſſedneſs of Jeſus the fruit of her Womb.* The meaning of which can be no more than this, That when they Pray to *Mary* the Mother of Jeſus, it is a tacite acknowledgement, that Jeſus was born of her, and that the Son muſt be a very Glorious Prince, when the Mother is ſo highly exalted upon account of her Relation to him, as to have ſo many devout Prayers and Hymns offered up to her. But does this

prove,

prove, that the Prayers, which are immediately directed to the Virgin *Mary*, are *principally directed* to Chriſt, becauſe *Mary* was his Mother, which is the whole Myſtery of the buſineſs. Suppoſe Chriſt ſhould think himſelf honoured by thoſe Prayers, which are offered to his Mother, yet is there no difference between praying to Chriſt, and that Honour we do him in praying to his Mother? A late Author indeed tells us, that the *Veneration, which we give to* Mary, *redounds to Jeſus: All Honour given to the Mother, tending to the Glory of the Son; for as he communicates with her in Fleſh and Blood; ſo alſo doth he partake with her in her Qualities and Perfections, and therefore he is a ſharer in that Homage and Obſervance, that is made to her.* This is a new ſort of Conſubſtantiation, and Communication of Properties; but yet how much ſoever we honour Jeſus, when we pray to *Mary*, yet we do not pray to Jeſus, when we pray to *Mary*; and therefore theſe Prayers are principally and immediately directed to *Mary*, not to God or Chriſt; and therefore to offer ten Prayers to *Mary*, for one to God, look very like *honouring* Mary *much more than her Son, or God the Father.* Ibid p. 5.

Well, but *ſhe is the Mother of God, and Bleſſed amongſt Women*; but how does her being Chriſts Mother entitle her to a greater ſhare in our Prayers and Devotions than Chriſt himſelf? It is indeed a great Honour to her to be the Mother of Jeſus, but does this entitle her to that Worſhip and Homage, which is due to her Son? She is the happieſt Mother among Women, but does this advance her above Angels and Arch-Angels? For my part I ſee no reaſon to think, that her bearing Chriſt in her Womb, which was a ſingular Favour conferred on her, but has nothing of Merit in it, ſhould advance her above the moſt Eminent Apoſtles and Martyrs, who with undaunted Courage and unwearied Induſtry propagated the Goſpel throughout the World, and were the great Miniſters of his Kingdom: I am ſure our Saviour does not ſeem to attribute any ſuch mighty Vertue to the Maternity of *Mary*, when a certain Woman ſaid unto him, *Bleſſed is the Womb that bare thee, and the Paps which thou haſt ſucked*; he anſwered, *yea rather Bleſſed are they, who hear the Word of God and keep it.* And in another place, when ſome told him, *behold thy Mother and thy Brethren ſtand without deſiring to ſpeak with thee, he anſwered and ſaid unto him, that told him, who is my Mother? And who are my Brethren? and he ſtretched forth his hand towards his Diſciples, ſaying, behold my Mother and my Brethren, for whoſever ſhall do the Will of my Father, which is in Heaven, the ſame is my Mother, and Siſter, and.* Luke 11. 27. Matth. 12. 46. &c.

and Brother. Which prefers his meaneſt Diſciples before the Mother of his Fleſh, conſidered only as his Mother; which he would not have done, had the bare Maternity of *Mary* advanced her above all other Creatures.

Well, but *ſhe is moſt acceptable to God in her Interceſſion for us.* Did the Angel tell them this too, as well as that ſhe is Bleſſed among Women? Whence then do they learn it? Is it only becauſe ſhe is a Mother? Have all Mothers then ſuch a natural Authority over their Sons, even when they are Soveraign Princes? Cannot the Eternal Son of God chuſe an Earthly Mother, but he muſt admit her into the Throne with him, and govern his Kingdom, if not by her Commands, yet by her Importunities and Requeſts? This is thought a great weakneſs in Earthly Princes, and uſually proves fatal to their Government; and yet it is much more tolerable in Earth than in Heaven. What has the Mother of his Fleſh to do, to intermeddle in the affairs of his Spiritual Kingdom, which ſhe is not capable of managing? She had no Authority in the Church, while ſhe was on Earth, which methinks her Maternity might give her as much Right to, as to be Queen-Regent of Heaven. When Chriſt was a Child he lived in Subjection to *Mary* and *Joſeph*, though he began early to give them a Specimen of a Superiour Power he had, and ſuch a work to do, as diſcharged him from Subjection to Earthly Parents. When he was but twelve years old, he told his Mother, *how was it, that ye ſought me, wiſt ye not that I muſt be about my Fathers buſineſs?* When his Mother at the Marriage in *Cana* of *Galilee* acquainted him, that their Wine was ſpent, and inſinuated her deſire, that he ſhould help them, he rebukes her for it, *Woman what have I to do with thee? my hour is not yet come.* She was not to direct him, what to do in ſuch matters; and can we think then, that now he is advanced to the Right Hand of God, he will ſuffer her to intermeddle in the adminiſtration of his Kingdom.

Luke 2. 48. 49.

John 2. 3, 4.

But our Author *believes it damnable, to think the Virgin* Mary *more powerful in Heaven than Chriſt, or that ſhe can in any thing command him.* It is well the *Impera Redemptori, command the Redeemer,* is at laſt diſowned by them, though it may be ſome may think it a little too much to call it *damnable*; becauſe whatever Papiſts believe now, there was a time, when this was uſed in the Miſſals of the Roman Church; and will he ſay, that it was damnable then to uſe that Hymn?

I believe no Papiſt ever thought the Virgin *Mary* to be Omnipotent,

potent. much leſs, that ſhe can do more than Chriſt can, or can command him by a direct and Superior Authority; nor did any man, that I know of, ever charge them with this: and if it be only in this ſenſe, that he denies the Virgin to be more powerful in Heaven than Chriſt, it is nothing to the purpoſe; for it is poſſible for a Subject to be more powerful than his Prince, though he cannot command him, and can do nothing but by his Princes favour; but if he have ſo much the aſcendant of his Prince, that he can deny him nothing, that he does whatever he will have him, and ſuch things as no other conſideration ſhould incline him to do, but the deſire of ſuch a powerful Favourite; this man is really more powerful than the Prince, becauſe he has the direction and Government of the Princes Power: He has the Prince himſelf in his Power, and therefore is more powerful than he. And if this be the caſe of the Bleſſed Virgin, that ſhe has the Diſpoſal of Chriſt's Grace and Mercy, though not by a direct Authority, yet by her Intereſt in her Son, if he never denies that which ſhe asks, but grants that at her Interceſſion, which he would not grant without it; if the Papiſts believe this, they believe her to be more Powerful than Chriſt, and they have then good reaſon, as they do, to put up more frequent Prayers to her, than to God or Chriſt himſelf. And whether they do not believe this, and that at this very day, let any one judge, from theſe paſſages in *the Contemplations of the Life and Glory of the Holy* Mary, which is lately publiſhed in Engliſh, *Permiſſu Superiorum.* "There *p.* 7. he tells us, that God "hath by a Solemn Covenant pronounced *Mary* to be the Trea- Pag. 7.
"ſury of Wiſdom, Grace, and Sanctity under Jeſus. So that "whatever Gifts are beſtowed upon us by Jeſus, we receive them "by the Mediation of *Mary*: No one being gracious to Jeſus, "who is not devoted to *Mary*, nor hath any one been ſpecially "confident of the Patronage of *Mary*, who hath not through "her received a ſpecial Bleſſing from Jeſus. Whence it is one "great mark of the Predeſtination of the Elect, to be ſingularly "Devoted to *Mary*, ſince ſhe hath a full Power, as a Mother, to "obtain of Jeſus, whatever he can ask of God the Father, and "is comprehended within the Sphere of man's Predeſtination to "Glory, Redemption from Sin, and Regeneration by Grace. Nei-"ther hath any one petitioned *Mary*, who was refuſed by Jeſus, "nor truſted in *Mary*, and was abandoned by Jeſus.

"A

Pag. 9. "A little after he directs the Devotes of the Virgin, to "have a firm and unshaken confidence in her Patronage, a- "midst the greatest of our inward Conflicts with Sensuality, "and outward Tribulations from the adverse Casualties of "this Life; through a strong Judgment of her eminent Pow- "er, within the Empire of Jesus, grounded upon the singular "Prerogative of her Divine Maternity; for by vertue there- "of no State of man can be so unhappy, through the malice "of Satan, the heats of our Passions, or the Enormity of Sin, "which exceeds her Love towards the Disciples of Jesus, or "the efficacy of her Mediation for us unto Jesus: So that "though the condition of some great Sinners may be so de- "plorable, that all the limited Excellency, Merits and Power "of all the Saints and Angels, cannot effectually bend the "Mercies of Jesus to receive them, yet such is the accepta- "bleness of the Mother of Jesus to Jesus, that whoever is un- "der the Verge of her Protection, may confide in her Inter- "cessions to Jesus. He denying no Favour to her, whereby "the Wonders of man's Predestination and Redemption "through Jesus, may be magnified and promoted. So that the Blessed Virgin is more Powerful than all the Saints and Angels in Heaven; she has all the *Power* of Christ, all his Grace and Mercy in her hands, and can dispense it to such Sinners, whom Christ would not pity and relieve without her, and therefore is a more powerful Patroness of Sinners, than Christ himself is. And therefore he might well add in the next place, that all these *Blessings flow from Jesus to all through* Mary, *and may therefore justly refer them all to her, as to the most effectual Instrument, Channel, and Conveyance of all.* Now if this be true Representing, it is no Mis-representation to say, that a Papist believes the Virgin *Mary*, to be much more Powerful in Heaven than Christ; not that she has any Power of her own, but that she can more powerfully and *effectually bend the Mercies of Jesus to relieve Sinners, than the mercies of Jesus can bend themselves without her.*

SECT.

SECT. V.

IMAGES.

THAT the Worſhip of Images, as it was practiſed by the Heathens, is Idolatry, Monſieur *de Meaux* and the Repreſenter ſuppoſe; and therefore their Buſineſs is, to give ſuch an account of the Worſhip of Images, as practiſed in the Church of *Rome*, as to diſtinguiſh themſelves from Heathen Idolaters. To this purpoſe the Biſhop tells us, *The Council of* Trent *forbids us expreſly to believe any Divinity or Virtue in them, for which they ought to be reverenced, to demand any favour of them, or to put any truſt in them; and ordains, That all the Honour which is given to them, ſhould be referred to the Saints themſelves which are repreſented by them. That the Honour we render Images, is grounded upon their exciting in us the remembrance of thoſe they repreſent. That by humbling our ſelves before the Image of Chriſt crucified, we ſhow what is our ſubmiſſion to our Saviour. So that to ſpeak preciſely, and according to the Eccleſiaſtical Stile, when we honour the Image of an Apoſtle or Martyr, our intention is not ſo much to honour the Image, as to honour the Apoſtle or Martyr in the preſence of the Image. Thus the Pontifical tells us, and the Council of* Trent *expreſſes the ſame thing, when it ſays, The Honour we render to Images, has ſuch a reference to thoſe they repreſent, that by the means of thoſe Images which we kiſs, and before which we kneel, we adore Jeſus Chriſt, and honour the Saints, whoſe Types they are.* To the ſame purpoſe the Repreſenter ſpeaks, and almoſt in the ſame words. So that the Sum of their Apology is this, That they do not believe Images to have any Divinity in them, or to be Gods, and therefore do not pray to, nor put their truſt in the Image, nor ſo much honour the Image in thoſe external Expreſſions of Reverence they pay to it, by kiſſing it, and kneeling before it, as Chriſt, or the Saint whom the Image repreſents; and the uſefulneſs of Images to excite in us the remembrance of thoſe whom Pag. 9.

we love and honour, is a juſtifiable Reaſon of that Honour we pay to them.

This is a Matter of very great conſequence, and deſerves to be carefully ſtated; and therefore I ſhall ſtrictly examine, Whether this Expoſition will juſtify the worſhip of Images, and ſufficiently diſtinguiſh the Worſhip of the Ch. of *Rome*, from that Worſhip which the Heathens gave to their Images.

Monſieur *de Meaux* pretends, by his Expoſition of the Doctrines of the Church of *Rome*, to cut off Objections and Diſputes; that is, ſo to ſtate the Matter, that there may be no place for thoſe Objections which Proteſtants commonly urge againſt worſhipping Images. But I do not ſee, that he has made any Eſſay of this Nature in the Point of Image-Worſhip, but has left both all the Diſputes among themſelves, and with Proteſtants, untouched.

The Objections which Proteſtants urge againſt the Worſhip of Images, as taught and practiſed in the Church of *Rome*, are principally theſe four.

1. That it is expreſly forbid by the ſecond Commandment, without any limitation or exception.

2. That the Heathens are in Scripture charged with Idolatry in the Worſhip of Images.

3. That it is a violation of the Divine Majeſty, *crimen læſæ Majeſtatis*, to repreſent God by a material and ſenſleſs Image or Picture.

4. That a viſible Object of Worſhip, though conſidered only as a Repreſentation, is expreſly contrary to the Law of *Moſes*, and eſpecially to the ſpiritual Nature of the Chriſtian Worſhip.

Now I do not ſee, how the Biſhop's Expoſition takes off any of theſe Objections, which after all that he hath ſaid, are in full force ſtill, as I ſhall particularly ſhew.

1. Then he tells us, *That the Council of* Trent *forbids us expreſly to believe any Divinity or Virtue in Images, for which they ought to be reverenced.* We grant, the Council does forbid this; and he knows that we never charge them with it; though there are ſome practices of the Church of *Rome*, which look very ſuſpiciouſly that way: but then we ſay, the ſecond Commandment forbids the worſhip of all Images,

without any ſuch limitation; for there is not any one word in the Commandment to limit the Prohibition of worſhipping Images, to ſuch Images, as are believ'd to have any Divinity in them. The words of the Commandment are as general as can be, *Thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelf any Graven Image, nor the likeneſs of any thing that is in Heaven above, or in the Earth beneath, or in the Water under the Earth; thou ſhalt not bow down to them, nor worſhip them.* The Commandment takes no notice of any Divinity which is ſuppoſed to be in theſe Images, but only of the Repreſentation made by them, that they are the Likeneſs or Repreſentation of things in Heaven, or things on Earth, or things under the Earth; and therefore the whole Diſpute between Papiſts and Proteſtants about the ſenſe of the ſecond Commandment, and the ſtrict notion of an Idol, is left untouch'd by this Expoſition.

The Roman Doctors indeed tell us, that the Heathens worſhipped their Images as Gods, and did aſcribe Divinity to them; upon which account Monſieur *de Meaux* tells us, *All theſe words of the Council are like ſo many Characters to diſtinguiſh us from Idolaters; ſeeing we are ſo far from believing with them any Divinity annexed to the Images, that we do not attribute to them any Virtue, but that of exciting in us the remembrance of thoſe they repreſent.* But he knew very well, that Proteſtants deny, that the Heathens took their Images for Gods any more than Papiſts do; their Philoſophers deſpiſed the charge, and made the ſame Apologies for themſelves, which the Divines of the Church of *Rome* now do; and we may ſuppoſe, that common Heathens had much ſuch Apprehenſions about them, as common Papiſts have: Thoſe who had any ſenſe could not believe them to be Gods; and thoſe who have none, may believe any thing: but there is no great regard to be had to ſuch Mens Faith, whatever their Religion be, who are void of common Senſe. However this Diſpute, whether the Heathens did believe their Images to be Gods, or to have any more Divinity in them, than Papiſts attribute to their Images, is a Diſpute ſtill, and Monſieur *de Meaux* has not ſaid one word to prevent it; and therefore the Condemnation of the Heathens for worſhipping Images is ſtill a good Objection againſt the worſhip of Images in the Church of *Rome*, till he prove

Pag. 9.

See Dr. Stillingfleet's *Defence of the Diſcourſe of Idolatry*, p. 466, &c.

as well as aſſert this difference between them.

But indeed, tho I readily grant that the Church of *Rome* does not believe that there is any Divinity in their Images, and that the Heathens did believe that Conſecration brought down the Gods, whom they worſhipped by ſuch Repreſentations, and tied them by ſome inviſible Charms to their Image, that they might be always preſent there to receive their Worſhip; yet this makes no material difference in their Notion of Images.

The reaſon why the Heathens thought it neceſſary by ſome Magical Arts to faſten their Gods, or ſome Divine Powers to their Images, was not to incorporate them with their Images, but to ſecure a Divine Preſence there, to hear their Prayers, and receive their Sacrifices, without which all their Devotions paid to an Image were loſt; which was very neceſſary, eſpecially in the Worſhip of their Inferior Dæmons, whom they did not believe to be preſent in all places.

1 King. 18. 27. As *Elijah* mocked the Prieſts of *Baal*, *and ſaid, Cry aloud; for he is a God: either he is talking, or he is purſuing, or he is in a Journy, or peradventure he ſleepeth, and muſt be awaked.* But now, thoſe who believe that God is every where preſent to ſee and hear what we do; and that the Saints, who are not preſent in their Images, yet do certainly know (by what means ſoever it be) what Prayers and Homages are offered to them at their Images, need not call down any Divine Powers conſtantly to attend their Images, but only to procure their acceptance of thoſe Devotions, which are paid to them at their Images. And this is the difference between the Conſecration of Heathen and Popiſh Images: The firſt is to procure the Preſence of their Gods in their Images; the other to obtain the Favour of Chriſt, and the Saints, to accept thoſe Prayers and Oblations, and other Acts of Devotion which are offered to them at their Images; as to give but one Inſtance of it in a Prayer uſed at the Conſecration of the Croſs. *Sanctificetur lignum iſtud in nomine Pa-|-tris & Fi-|-lii, & Spiritus -|- Sancti, & benedictio illius ligni in quo membra ſancta ſalvatoris ſuſpenſa ſunt, ſit in iſto ligno; ut orantes inclinanteſq; ſe propter Deum ante iſtam crucem inveniant Corporis & Animæ ſanitatem. Let this Wood be ſanctified in the*

Pontif. in Bened. nov. crucis.

name

name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt; and let the Bleſſing of that Wood, on which the holy Members of our Saviour hung, be on this Wood; that thoſe, who pray and bow themſelves before this Croſs, may obtain Health both of Body and Soul. This peculiar Virtue which Conſecration beſtows on Images to obtain the Favour of Chriſt and his Saints, to thoſe who pray and worſhip before them, is all that the Heathens intended in calling down their Gods to attend their Images to hear and receive their Prayers and Sacrifices. They did not believe their Images to be Gods, but Silver, or Gold, Wood, or Braſs, or Stone, according to the Materials they were made of, as the Church of *Rome* does; but they thought their Gods were preſent to hear the Prayers they made before their Images; as the Church of *Rome* alſo believes, that Chriſt and his Saints have a peculiar regard to thoſe Prayers which are made before their Images, as is evident from their forms of conſecrating Images to ſuch an uſe. The Heathens did not put their truſt in an Image of Wood and Stone, but in that God, who was repreſented by that Image, and was there preſent to help them. And thus, tho the Church of *Rome does not demand any Favour of Images, nor put any Truſt in them*, yet ſhe expects the Relief and Acceptance of Chriſt and the Saints for that Worſhip ſhe pays to their Images; and I would deſire any Man to ſhow me the difference between theſe two, eſpecially when we conſider how much greater Vertue is attributed to ſome Images of the Bleſſed Virgin in the Church of *Rome*, than there is to others; as to the Image of the Lady of *Loretto*, &c. which can ſignify nothing leſs, than that the Virgin is more pleaſed with, and will more graciouſly accept our Worſhip before ſuch an Image, than any other; or elſe me-thinks the Devotoes of the Virgin ſhould not go ſo many Miles in Pilgrimage to the Lady of *Loretto*, as they often do, if they believed the Images of the Virgin which they had at home to be of equal Power: which is as much truſting in Images, and attributing a Divine Virtue to them, as ever the Heathens were guilty of. For me-thinks thoſe who ſtrictly adhere to the Letter of Scripture to prove that the Heathens believed their Images to be Gods, and did put their Truſt in them, becauſe the Scripture

ture expreſly ſays ſo, ſhould conſider alſo, that the Scripture expreſly tells us, *that the Idols of the Heathens are Silver and Gold, the Work of Mens hands; they have Mouths, but they ſpeak not; Eyes have they, but they ſee not; they have Ears, but they hear not, neither is there any Breath in their Mouths:* and therefore we have as much reaſon to conclude, that the Heathens did not put their Truſt in the material Images, which they knew to be no better than ſtupid ſenſeleſs matter, which could not of themſelves hear or help them, as to confeſs, that in ſome ſenſe they made Gods of them. For if the Heathens did not believe them to be dead ſenſeleſs Images, which could neither ſpeak, nor ſee, nor hear, but that they were really animated by inviſible Spirits; they were not ſuch dull and ſottiſh Idolaters, as the Pſalmiſt repreſents them; and if they did (as the Pſalmiſt takes it for granted they themſelves acknowledged) than it is certain they could not believe the material Images to be Gods, nor the Objects of their Hope and Truſt, and therefore might (as ſome of their Philoſophers in effect did) as ſafely renounce *believing any Divinity or Vertue in their Images, for which they ought to be reverenced, or demanding any Favour of them, or putting any Truſt in them,* as the Council of *Trent* does. So that their not believing any Divinity in their Images, does neither excuſe them from the Breach of the ſecond Commandment, nor ſufficiently diſtinguiſh the Church of *Rome's* worſhipping Images, from that Worſhip which the Heathens gave them; at leaſt the Biſhop has ſaid nothing to anſwer or prevent theſe Objections againſt Image-worſhip, which he pretends to be the deſign of his Expoſition.

Pſalm 135. 15, 16, 17.

2. As a fuller Explication of the Doctrine of the Church about Image-worſhip, Monſieur *de Meaux* adds, that the Council of *Trent* ordains, *That all the Honour which is given to them* (Images) *ſhould be referred to the Saints themſelves, which are repreſented by them:* Or, as the Council expreſſes it, *The Honour we render to Images has ſuch a reference to thoſe they repreſent,* (ad Prototypa quæ illæ repreſentant, *to the Prototypes which they repreſent*) *that by the means of thoſe Images* (per Imagines, *by thoſe Images*) *we kiſs, and before which we kneel, we adore Jeſus Chriſt, and honour the Saints, whoſe Types they are.*

Quorum

Quorum illæ ſimilitudinem gerunt ; *Whoſe likeneſs they are, or whom they repreſent.*

Hitherto we have no Expoſition at all of the Doctrine of the Church about Image-Worſhip, but only a bare relation what the Council ſays, that Images muſt be worſhipped only upon account of their Repreſentation ; and that the Worſhip which is given to the Image, is referred to the Prototype : This all Roman-Catholicks agree in ; but yet there is an endleſs Diſpute among them, about the Nature and Degree of this Worſhip, and it will be neceſſary to take a ſhort view of it.

They are all agreed, that at leaſt the external Acts of Adoration are to be paid to Images, ſuch as Kiſſing, Kneeling, Bowing, Proſtration, Incenſe ; this *Durandus*, and *Holcot*, and *Picus Mirandula* allowed ; they all agreed, that the Worſhip which was given to Images, is upon account of Repreſentation, or as Chriſt and his Saints are repreſented by them, and worſhipped in that Worſhip, which is given to their Images ; but then there was a threefold difference between them.

1. That ſome would not allow this Worſhip in a proper ſenſe to be given to the Images, but *improperly* and *abuſively* ; becauſe at the preſence of the Image, which excites in us the remembrance of the Object, we worſhip the Object repreſented by it, Chriſt or his Saints, as if they were actually preſent ; this was the Opinion of *Durandus*, *Holcot*, and *Picus Mirandula*, who could hardly eſcape the cenſure of Hereſy for it ; and that which excuſed them, as *Vaſquez* ſays, was, That they agreed with the Catholick Church in performing all external Acts of Adoration to Images, and that they differed only in manner of ſpeaking from the reſt. *Vaſquez* Diſp. 106. c. 1.

2. *Thomas Aquinas*, and his Followers, and ſeveral great Divines ſince the Council of *Trent*, teach, That the ſame Worſhip is to be given to the Image, which is due to the Prototype ; and therefore as Chriſt muſt be worſhipped with *Latria*, or a ſupream Worſhip, ſo muſt the Image of Chriſt, becauſe the Image is worſhipped only on account of its Repreſentation, and therefore muſt be worſhipped with the

the ſame Worſhip with the thing repreſented: and the motion of the Mind to an Image, as an Image, is the ſame with the motion to the Thing repreſented. Which ſeems the moſt reaſonable Account; for if I worſhip Chriſt by his Image, I muſt give that Worſhip to the Image which I intend for Chriſt, becauſe in that caſe the Image is in Chriſt's place and ſtead to me.

3. The third Opinion is, That though we muſt worſhip Images, yet we muſt not give the Worſhip of *Latria* to them, no not to the Image of Chriſt himſelf, but an inferior degree of Worſhip. This ſome Divines aſſerted on the Authority of the Council of *Nice*, which expreſly determined, that *Latria* is not to be given to Images. But this is the moſt abſurd Opinion of all; for if we muſt worſhip Images only upon the account of their Repreſentation, we muſt give that Worſhip to them, which is due to the thing repreſented by them; and if we give any other Worſhip to them, we muſt worſhip them for their own ſakes. And what is that Worſhip which is due to them as ſeparated from the Prototype? What Worſhip is due to carved and poliſhed Braſs and Stone? Whoever deſires to ſee theſe three different Opinions, with the proper Reaſons of them, explained more at large, may conſult Dr. *Stillingfleet*'s learned Defence of his Diſcourſe of Idolatry, *Part* 2. *Chap.* 1. *pag.* 575, *&c.* Now the Council of *Trent* only determines, that the Honour we give to Images, muſt be referred to the Prototypes, that we muſt adore Chriſt and his Saints in that Worſhip which we give to their Images: which ſeems to countenance the ſecond Opinion, That the Worſhip of *Latria* is to be given to the Image of Chriſt, becauſe that is the Worſhip which we muſt give to Chriſt: But then the Council refers to the ſecond Council of *Nice*; which determines the quite contrary; and I dare not undertake to reconcile the Council with it ſelf, ſince the Fathers of that Council would not plainly decide this Controverſy among their Divines.

Let us then try, if we can diſcover, what Monſieur *de Meaux* thinks of this Matter; what Worſhip that is which he allows to be given to Images.

Now,

Now, as far as I can gueſs, he is of *Durandus* his Opinion, That all External Acts of Adoration are to be performed before the Image, but that the Image is not to be properly worſhipped, but only Chriſt in the preſence of his Image, as repreſenting his Perſon to us, and exciting in us the remembrance of him. Thus he tells us, That *while the Image* Pag. 9. *of Chriſt crucified, being preſent before our Eyes, cauſes ſo precious a remembrance in our Souls, we are moved to teſtify by ſome exteriour ſigns, how far our gratitude bears us; and by humbling our ſelves before the Image, we ſhow what is our ſubmiſſion to our Saviour.* So that he allows of *humbling our ſelves before the Image*, that is, of paying the External Acts of Worſhip before it. Well! but is this to worſhip the Image? For that he tells us, *to ſpeak properly, and according to the Eccleſiaſtical Stile*, (I ſuppoſe he means a new Modern Stile, for the old Eccleſiaſtical Stile did ſomewhat differ) *when we honour the Image of an Apoſtle or Martyr, our Intention is not ſo much to honour the Image, as to honour the Apoſtle or Martyr in the preſence of the Image:* that is, this is not properly, but *improperly and abuſively* called the Worſhip or Honour of the Image: but Chriſt, or his Saints, are properly worſhipped before, or in preſence of their Images, as repreſenting them to us; which was exactly the Opinion of *Durandus*.

This certainly is the leaſt that can be made of the Worſhip of Images; and yet as far removed as this Opinion ſeems to be from the Opinion of St. *Thomas*, who affirms, that the Worſhip of *Latria* is to be given to the Image of Chriſt; I take them to be the very ſame, though very differently expreſſed. The right ſtating of this, will mightily tend to clear this perplexed Controverſy; and therefore I ſhall do it with all the plainneſs I can.

1. Then I obſerve, that to pay the external Acts of Adoration *to*, or *before*, or *in preſence* of a repreſentative Object as repreſenting, ſignify the very ſame thing; it is all one kind of Worſhip, becauſe the formal Reaſon is the ſame in all; and that is, the Repreſentation. When I bow to the Image of Chriſt, I bow to it as repreſenting Chriſt to me, who is the ultimate Object of my Worſhip; when I

bow before, or in the preſence of the Image, I do the ſame thing, tho I give it a new Name; I bow before it, as repreſenting Chriſt to me, as if he himſelf were there perſonally preſent in the Image. When I bow to the Image, I do not bow to the Wood or Stone, but to Chriſt as repreſented in the Image: when I bow to Chriſt before the Image, I do the ſame thing, I bow to Chriſt as repreſented in the Image which ſtands before me. For ſuppoſe Chriſt were there preſent inſtead of the Image, would it make any difference in my Worſhip, to ſay, That I bow to Chriſt, or before him, or in his preſence, when they all ſignify, that I direct my Worſhip to him as perſonally preſent; no more difference is there in bowing to, or before, or in the preſence of the Image, when I direct my Worſhip to Chriſt as repreſented by the Image. There may indeed be a great difference between bowing to my Prince, and in the preſence of my Prince, when theſe Expreſſions ſignify different Objects: for I may bow to another Man *in the preſence* of my Prince, and in that Act I do not bow *to* my Prince; but when *to*, and *before*, and *in preſence*, do not diſtinguiſh the Objects, the Act is the ſame: If the preſence of the Image were an accidental thing, and had no relation to that Worſhip which we pay to Chriſt or the Saints, where ſuch Images are preſent, there would be a great difference between bowing *to*, and *in preſence* of the Image; but if theſe Images be on purpoſe ſet up in Conſecrated Places, and are themſelves conſecrated for that uſe, to repreſent Chriſt and the Saints to us; whether we ſay we bow to them, or before them, we do the ſame thing, and with the ſame intention, to worſhip Chriſt and his Saints as repreſented by them. So that if we own, as the Biſhop does, that the Honour done before the Image, goes to the Prototype, to Chriſt, or the Saints repreſented by ſuch Images, we need not diſpute about the manner of expreſſing it; he may take his own way of ſpeaking, that he honours Chriſt in the preſence of his Image, ſo he honours Chriſt as repreſented by the Image; and therefore, in Scripture, to fall down before and to the Image, and to worſhip the Image, are all equivalent Expreſſions.

There

There is indeed a vaſt difference between bowing to, or before an Image, which repreſents God, or Chriſt, or ſome Divine Being to us, as the Object of our Worſhip; and bowing towards a Place, or worſhipping God towards a Place, as the Jews worſhipped towards the Temple, and in the Temple towards the Mercy-Seat; the one was abſolutely forbid by the Jewiſh Law, the other allowed and practiſed by the devouteſt Worſhippers of God: which argues, that there is ſome difference between them; and it is not hard to ſay, wherein the difference conſiſts, that one is a repreſentative Object, the other only a Circumſtance of Worſhip. To bow to, or before an Image, is to worſhip the Image, or God or Chriſt by the Image, which makes the Image as repreſenting the Prototype, the Object of our Worſhip; but which way ſoever we look or bow, towards the Eaſt, or towards the Weſt, God alone is the immediat Object of our Worſhip, the Place only the Circumſtance of Worſhip; whenever we bow to God, we muſt bow towards ſome Place or other: but the Place does not repreſent God to us as an Image does, and therefore is no Object of Worſhip: which ſhows what little reaſon the Proteſtor had to compare *bowing to the Altar, and kneeling to the Sacrament*, as he calls it, with bowing to an Image. There is no Man of the Church of *England*, that I know of, who bows to the Altar; I am ſure the Church no where teaches any ſuch Practice. She only recommends to her Children bowing of the Body to God, when they come in and go out of his Houſe; and though the Communion Table, or Altar, is generally ſo ſcituated at the Eaſt end of the Church, as to be oppoſite to the entrance of it; for which reaſon ſome have called it, bowing *towards the Altar*; yet our Church teaches us to have no regard at all to it. And Arch-Biſhop *Laud*, in his Speech in the *Star-Chamber*, declares, That *if there were no Table ſtanding, he would worſhip God when he came into his Houſe:* So that there is no need *to find any Hole*, as the Proteſtor ſpeaks, *to get out at with the Altar*, for that was never in yet, as far as this Controverſy is concerned; and therefore I am like to make no breach for him *to follow it with his Image*. Nor does any Man *kneel to the Sacrament*, but only

See Dr. Stillingfl. *Defence of the Diſc. of Idol.* P. 703, &c. *And ſeveral Conferences between a Romiſh Prieſt*, &c. P. 211, &c.

 receive

receive the Sacrament kneeling; and if he cannot distinguish between an Act of Worship to the Sacrament, and a devout Posture of receiving it; yet the meaneſt Son of the Church of *England* can. Why does he not as well ſay, that when we kneel at Prayers, we worſhip the Common-Prayer Book which lies before us, and out of which we read, as that we worſhip the Bread, when we receive and eat it with devout Paſſions upon our Knees.

But to return to the Expoſition.

2. I obſerve, that there is a great difference between a memorative Sign, and the Repreſentation of an Image: both of them indeed excite in us the remembrance of ſomething, but in ſuch different manners, as quite alter the nature of them. It is neceſſary to take notice of this, becauſe I find Monſieur *de Meaux*, and after him the Repreſenter, very much to equivocate in this Matter: it is a very innocent thing to worſhip God or Chriſt, when any natural or inſtituted Sign brings them to our minds, even in the preſence of ſuch a Sign: As if a Man upon viewing the Heavens, and the Earth, and the Creatures that are in it, ſhould raiſe his Soul to God, and adore the great Creator of the World; or upon the accidental ſight of a natural Croſs, ſhould call to mind the Love of his Lord, who died for him, and bow his Soul to him in the moſt ſubmiſſive Adorations; becauſe, I ſay, this is very innocent, the Biſhop wou'd perſwade his Readers, that this is the only uſe they make of Images, *to excite in us the remembrance of thoſe they repreſent*; and mightily wonders at the *little juſtice of thoſe, who treat with the term of Idolatry, that religious Sentiment, which moves them to uncover their Heads, or bow them before the Image of the Croſs, in remembrance of him who was crucified for the Love of us.* And that it is ſufficient to diſtinguiſh them from the Heathen Idolaters, *That they declare, that they will not make uſe of Images, but to raiſe the mind towards Heaven, to the end that they may there honour Jeſus Chriſt or his Saints, and in the Saints God himſelf, who is the Author of all Sanctity and Grace.*

Now it is certain, an Image will call to our remembrance the Perſon it repreſents, as the preſence of the Perſon himſelf will make us remember him; but this vaſtly differs from

a meer memorative Sign. For the uſe of Images in the Church of *Rome*, is not primarily for Remembrance, but for Worſhip, as the Council of *Trent* expreſly teaches. *That the Images of Chriſt, and the Virgin the Mother of God, and other Saints, are eſpecially to be had and kept in Churches, and due Honour and Veneration to be given to them——becauſe the Honour given to them, is referred to the Prototypes, which they repreſent; ſo that by the Images, which we kiſs, and before which we uncover our Heads, and proſtrate our ſelves, we adore Chriſt, and venerate the Saints, whoſe likeneſs they bear.* Theſe are the words of the Council, and it would be a very odd Comment upon ſuch a Text to ſay, that Images ſerve only for Remembrance.

A meer Sign, which only calls Chriſt to our Minds, can deſerve no Honour or Worſhip; but a repreſenting Sign, which puts us in mind of Chriſt by repreſenting his Perſon to us, as if he were preſent, whether it raiſes our hearts to him in Heaven or not, yet according to the Council of *Trent*, it muſt direct our Worſhip to him, as repreſented in his Image. When Men go to Church to worſhip *Chriſt*, or the Virgin *Mary*, before their Images, it may be preſumed they think of them before they ſee their Images, and therefore do not go to be put in remembrance of them by their Images, but to worſhip them before the Images, in that Worſhip which they give to the Images. And therefore when the Biſhop ſpeaks ſo often of the Virtue of Images, to excite in us the remembrance of the Perſons they repreſent, to reconcile him with himſelf, and with the Council of *Trent*, which he pretends to own, we muſt not underſtand him as if Images were of no uſe but to be helps to memory, and are honoured for no other reaſon, (which is no reaſon at all) as the unwary Reader will be apt to miſtake him; but that theſe viſible Images repreſent to us the inviſible Objects of our Worſhip, and give us ſuch a ſenſe of their Power and Preſence, as makes us fall down and worſhip them before thoſe Repreſentations, which we honour for their ſakes; that is, tho they ſerve for remembrance, yet not as meer memorative Signs, but as memorative or repreſentative Objects of Worſhip.

3. I obſerve, that it is the very ſame thing whether we ſay, that we worſhip Chriſt as repreſented by the Image, or worſhip the Image as repreſenting Chriſt, for they both ſignify that Chriſt is worſhipped in and by his Image, that the Honour and Worſhip is given to the Image, and referr'd to the Prototype. If Chriſt be worſhipped as repreſented by the Image, then the Worſhip which is intended for Chriſt is given to the Image in his Name, and as his Repreſentative; if the Image be worſhipped as repreſenting Chriſt, then the Worſhip which is given to the Image, is not for it ſelf, but for Chriſt, whom it repreſents; which differ juſt as much as a Viceroy's being honoured for the King, or the King's being honoured in his Viceroy. And therefore I wonder, that any Man of Underſtanding and Judgment, as Monſieur *de Meaux* certainly is, ſhould think there is any great matter in ſaying, *When we honour the Image of an Apoſtle or Martyr, our Intention is not ſo much to honour the Image, as to honour the Apoſtle or Martyr in the preſence of the Image*; that is, in and by the Image, as I have ſhowed that Phraſe ſignifies, when it is referred to a Repreſentative Object: for it is the very ſame thing to ſay, we honour the Image as repreſenting the Martyr, or we honour the Martyr as repreſented by the Image.

Having premiſed theſe things, let us now compare the Opinion of Monſieur *de Meaux*, with the Opinion of St. *Thomas Aquinas* about the Worſhip of Images; and tho the firſt is thought by ſome Men to ſay a great deal too little, and the other a great deal too much; yet it will appear, that their Opinions in this matter are the very ſame.

They both agree, That Chriſt and his Saints are repreſented by their Images; they both agree, that Chriſt and his Saints are worſhipped in their Images, as repreſented by them; they both agree, that no other Worſhip is to be paid to, or before, or in preſence of the Image, but only that Worſhip which is due to the *Prototype*, to Chriſt or his Saints repreſented by ſuch Images: Hence *Thomas* aſſerts, that the Image is to be worſhipped with that Worſhip which is due to the Prototype; the Image of Chriſt with *Latria*, becauſe that is due to Chriſt; and the Images of the Saints with *Dulia*,

Dulia, becauſe that degree of Worſhip is proper to them; and the Biſhop teaches, *That when they honour the Image of an Apoſtle or Martyr, their Intention is not ſo much to honour the Image, as to honour the Apoſtle or Martyr in preſence of the Image:* that is, they perform no other Act of Worſhip in the preſence of the Images, but that which is proper to the Apoſtle and Martyr; and therefore they both agree, that there is but one motion of the Mind to the Image, and to the Prototype repreſented by it; that is, as the Biſhop ſpeaks, they have but one Intention, and that is to honour the Apoſtle or Martyr in the preſence of the Image: and yet after all, they ſeem vaſtly to differ; for *Thomas* ſays, that they give the Worſhip of the Prototype to its Image; that is, that they worſhip the Image of Chriſt with *Latria*, which is the Worſhip due to Chriſt; but the Biſhop will not own, that they properly give any Worſhip at all to Images, but only worſhip Chriſt, or the Saints in the preſence of the Images; Chriſt indeed with *Latria*, and the Saints with *Dulia*, but their Images properly with neither: and yet this difference is only in words, as *Vaſquez* confeſſes concerning *Durandus* and *Holcot*, whom Mr. *de Meaux* follows, *that they agreed with the Catholick Church, in performing all external Acts of Adoration to Images, and that they differed only in manner of ſpeaking from the reſt.*

For, as I have already ſhew'd, to worſhip the Image, or before, and in the preſence of the Image, when it ſignifies a Repreſentative Object, is the ſame thing; and there is no difference between worſhipping the Image as repreſenting Chriſt, and worſhipping Chriſt as repreſented by the Image; and yet this is all the difference between Mr. *de Meaux* and *Thomas Aquinas:* Tho I think *Thomas* ſpeaks moſt properly; for if Chriſt be worſhipped in his Image, we muſt give the Worſhip to the Image, which we intended for Chriſt, becauſe Chriſt is worſhipped in that Worſhip we give to his Image; and therefore he cannot be worſhipped by his Image, if his Image be not worſhipped; of which more preſently.

Durandus indeed, whoſe Opinion Mr. *de Meaux* ſeems to follow, did in words oppoſe the Doctrine of *Thomas*, that the Worſhip of the Prototype ought not to be given to an Image,

Image, *becauſe the Image and the Prototype were two diſtinct things; and therefore what belonged to the Exemplar could not be attributed to an Image, however conſidered as an Image; and ſo the Worſhip due to the Exemplar could not be given to the Image:* but yet he plainly grants all that *Thomas* intended by it; *that the Image may be ſaid to be worſhipped with the ſame Worſhip with the thing repreſented; becauſe at the preſence of the Image, we worſhip the Object repreſented by it, as if he were actually preſent.*

But I have a better reaſon than this to believe that they were both of a Mind, tho they expreſſed themſelves very differently; and that is, becauſe their Arguments, whereby they confirm their ſeveral Opinions are the ſame, and then it is not likely that their Opinions ſhould much differ.

Durand. in Sent. 3. Diſt. 9. q. 2.

Durandus proves, *That the Images are not to be worſhipped, but only improperly and abuſively; becauſe at their preſence we call to mind thoſe Objects repreſented by them, which are worſhipped before the Images, as if they were preſent,* by ſuch Arguments as theſe: that Worſhip properly belongs only to that Being in whom the cauſe of Worſhip is, and that only to his Perſon, upon account of his adorable Perfections, which are the cauſe of that Worſhip; and therefore *Latria*, or Supream Worſhip can be due only to God, upon account of his Deity. But that which is no Subject capable of Holineſs and Vertue, cannot in it ſelf be the term of Adoration; and therefore proper Worſhip can never be due to the Image of Chriſt, or to his Croſs; for tho Chriſt be repreſented by his Image, there is a real difference in the thing, and in the conception between the Image and the thing repreſented; and therefore, properly ſpeaking, the ſame Worſhip is never due to the Image, that is to the Object repreſented by it.

Thomas Aquinas on the other ſide proves, that the Image muſt be worſhipped with that Worſhip which is due to the Prototype, or the thing repreſented by it, by much the ſame Arguments.

1. *That no irrational Creature is capable of Worſhip, but with a reſpect to a rational Being,* which anſwers to *Durandus* his reaſon, that Worſhip properly belongs only to that Being, in whom the cauſe of Worſhip is; and that which is no Subject capable

capable of Holineſs and Vertue (as no inanimate, or irrational Creature is, and therefore no Image) cannot in it ſelf be the term of Adoration. From which it appears that they muſt agree, that no proper Worſhip can be given to Images. 2. *Becauſe Images are to be worſhipped upon account of their Repreſentation; therefore they are to be worſhipped with the ſame Worſhip of the thing repreſented.* 3. *Becauſe the motion of the Mind towards an Image, as an Image, is the ſame with the motion towards the thing repreſented.* So that *Thomas* plainly allows, that the Image is not to be worſhipped at all upon its own account, but only as it repreſents; and to worſhip the Image as it repreſents, is the very ſame act with worſhipping the Object as repreſented by the Image; becauſe the motion of the Mind towards an Image, as an Image, that is, as it repreſents, is the ſame with the motion towards the thing repreſented: That to worſhip an Image as repreſenting Chriſt, is the ſame thing with worſhipping Chriſt as repreſented by the Image; and therefore the ſame Worſhip which is due to Chriſt, muſt be given to his Image, as repreſenting him; or to him as repreſented by the Image. So that according to *Thomas* his reaſoning, there is no difference between his giving the Worſhip of Chriſt to his Image, as repreſenting him, and *Durandus* his worſhipping Chriſt before his Image, as repreſented by it, as if he were actually preſent. *Thomas* could not have quarrelled with *Durandus*, becauſe he owns it is the ſame thing, tho *Durandus* quarrels with *Thomas*.

And therefore *Vaſquez*, who ſeems to underſtand the Doctrine of *Thomas* as well as any Man, acknowledges that *Durandus* and *Holcot* differed only in manner of ſpeaking from the reſt; and freely declares his own Opinion to be, that *an Image cannot be lawfully worſhipped any other way than as in and by that the Exemplar is made the term and next material Object of Adoration:* and he gives this Reaſon for it, *becauſe no inanimate thing is of it ſelf capable of Worſhip; but an Image conſidered as an Image, but without the Exemplar, is an inanimate thing.* This is the Doctrine of *Thomas* according to *Vaſquez*, which allows no more Worſhip to an Image, conſidered in it ſelf, then *Durandus* does, and yet he ſays, *that it may be*

Vaſquez *Diſp.* 106. *c.* 1.

Idem *Diſp.* 108. *c.* 3. *c.* 9.

Disp. 109. c. 1. *delivered absolutely, that Images are to be worshipped with* Latria, *if by that be meant the same Worship, which is given to the Exemplar:* And therefore *Bellarmine* tells us, *That to give the* Bellarm. *de* Cultu Imag. l. 2. *Worship of* Latria *to the Image of Christ, as representing Christ, is to worship the Image but improperly,* and *per accidens*; and this reconciles *Thomas* and *Durandus*, who grants that the Image may be said to be worshipped improperly and abusively, as in presence of the Image, the Object is worshipped represented by it, as if it were actually present.

As for *Durandus* his Argument against *Thomas* his Doctrine, that the Worship of the Prototype is to be given to the Image, *That there is a real difference in the thing, and in the conception between the Image and the thing represented; and therefore, properly speaking, the same Worship is never due to the* Pag. 5. *Image, that is to the Object represented by it.* I think, if any Worship of Images were justifiable, this Argument were eaily answered. For tho there be a great difference indeed in the nature of things, between the Image and the Object, between Christ suppose, and his Image which represents him; yet in this case there is none in the Conception; for an Image when it receives our Worship in the place and stead of the Prototype, does not represent according to the usual nature of an Image by its likeness and similitude; for so both in the thing and in the conception the Image differs from the Object it represents; but it represents as a Proxy and Substitute, who in the eye of the Law, is the same Person with him, whom he represents. Thus *Thomas* must understand the Representation of an Image, when he says, that it is the same motion of the Mind to the Image, and the exemplar represented by it; that is, that the Image is supposed to supply the place of Christ, and represent him present to us; and therefore we worship the Image as Christ's Representative with that Worship we would give to him were he actually present; this is not indeed the natural use of Images, nor is it natural to worship them, but this is the true interpretation of *Thomas* his Doctrine; and therefore *Gregorius de Valentia* expresly tells us, *that the Image is worshipped in* Greg. de Valent. *de Idolol.* l. 2. c. 7. *Christ's stead:* And Cardinal *Cajetan* says, *That Christ him-*Cajent. in Aq. 3 p. q. 25. art. 3. *self is the reason of the Worship of the Image; and his being in*

the

the Image is the condition by which the reaſon of the Worſhip doth excite Men to worſhip and terminate it: that is, Chriſt is in his Image, as a King is in his Viceroy, or any Man in his legal Proxy: This is what *Suarez* meant by the *eſſe reale*, and *eſſe repreſentativum* of the Prototype; that tho the Image does not contain Chriſt in the firſt ſenſe in his own proper Perſon, yet it does in the ſecond ſenſe as his legal Proxy, and Repreſentative. And this *Durandus* himſelf muſt acknowledg, if there be any ſenſe in his words, *That at the preſence of the Image, we worſhip the Object repreſented by it, as if he were actually preſent.* For why ſhould he in the preſence of the Image, worſhip Chriſt repreſented by it, as if he were actally preſent, unleſs he account the Image the Subſtitute and Repreſentative of Chriſt, as if he were actually preſent; and this, I think, reconciles that appearance of difference between *Thomas* and *Durandus*, occaſioned by a Miſapprehenſion of *Thomas* his Doctrine. *Durandus* owns the Worſhip of Chriſt in the preſence of the Image, as he is repreſented in the Image, as if he were actually preſent, which is Mr. *de Meaux* his Opinion alſo in this matter; but he will not allow this, but only *in an improper* and *abuſive* ſenſe, to be the Worſhip of the Image, becauſe the Image is not Chriſt, but both in the thing and in the conception is diſtinguiſhed from him; and therefore to worſhip the Image of Chriſt, would be to worſhip Wood or Stone, with the Worſhip of Chriſt: Whereas *Thomas* conſiders the Image not as to its external matter or form, upon which account he denies any Worſhip to be given to it, but as the Proxy and Repreſentative of Chriſt; and thus it is Chriſt repreſented in the Image, and not the material Image, which is worſhipped; which is the very ſame with *Durandus* his way of worſhipping Chriſt as repreſented in the Image, in the preſence of the material Image; that is, he worſhips before the material Image, but worſhips only the Perſon of Chriſt, as repreſented by the Image. Suarez Diſp. 54 Sect. 4.

But this will be better underſtood by conſidering the nature and capacity of a legal Proxy or Repreſentative. Suppoſe *A* were to all intents and purpoſes a legal Proxy for *B*, to do, and to receive whatever *B* might do and receive

in his own Perſon; in this caſe *A* is not conſidered as *A*, in his own perſonal Capacity, but *A* is *B*, as his Proxy and Repreſentative. Suppoſe now that *C* owes a Sum of Mony, or a certain Homage to *B*, and pays it to *A* as *B*'s Proxy; that is, not as he is *A*, but *B*. When *C* worſhips *A* as repreſenting the Perſon of *B*, he is properly ſaid not to worſhip *A*, but *B*; becauſe he worſhips *A* not as *A*, but as *A* is *B*, in his Repreſentative Capacity. Now if you will ſuppoſe *A* to be the Image, and *B* to be Chriſt, this explains in what ſenſe *Thomas* worſhips the Image for Chriſt, not as the Image is Wood or Stone, but as it is the Repreſentative of Chriſt's Perſon. Now ſuppoſe *D* ſhould ſcruple paying the Worſhip of *B* to *A*, becauſe *A* is a diſtinct Perſon from *B*, and has no right to the ſame Worſhip; and therefore ſhould only worſhip *B* in the preſence of *A*, as repreſenting him; would not all the World ſee, that *D* and *C* meant and did the ſame thing, worſhipped *A* as the Repreſentative of *B*, tho *D* is pleaſed to phraſe it otherwiſe, and more improperly than *C* does; for the perſonal Capacity of *A* is not conſidered at all, when it is worſhipped for *B*, but only his Repreſentative Capacity; and this is the only difference between *Thomas* and *Durandus*. *Thomas* worſhips the Image in Chriſt's place and ſtead, as repreſenting Chriſt, without conſidering its natural Capacity as an Image of Wood or Stone; as *C* worſhips *A* as *B*'s Proxy, without conſidering *A*'s perſonal Capacity: but *Durandus* worſhips Chriſt as repreſented by the Image (which is the ſame with the Image repreſenting Chriſt) in the preſence of the Image conſidered in its natural Capacity; as *D* worſhips *B* as repreſented by *A*, in the preſence of *A*, conſidered in his perſonal Capacity; that is, he worſhips repreſentative *A* in the preſence of perſonal *A*, which is the ſame thing that *C* does, but is a more uncouth and abſurd way of ſpeaking.

Thus to proceed, When *C* worſhips *A* as *B*'s Proxy, in his name and ſtead, does he worſhip *A* or *B*? he worſhips *A* indeed, but conſidered as *B*; and therefore the Worſhip given to *A* in the name of *B*, is not the Worſhip of *A*, but of *B*; And will any Man ſay that *A* and *B* are two Objects of Worſhip? when in this ſenſe, *A* is *B*, and is conſidered only

only as *B*, that is, as *B*'s Proxy; and therefore *A* conſidered as *A*, in his own perſonal Capacity, is not worſhipped at all, neither abſolutely nor relatively, *per ſe*, nor *per accidens*; but if *A* be worſhipped only as *B*, to ſay, that *A* is worſhipped relatively, or *per accidens*, is to ſay that *B*, who is worſhipped in *A*, is worſhipped both abſolutely and relatively, properly and improperly, *per ſe* and *per accidens*; which are ſome of the Objections which *Catharinus* and others uſe againſt *Thomas*.

Much at the ſame rate others compare *Thomas* his Doctrine of worſhipping the Image with the Worſhip of the Prototype, as repreſented by it, with worſhipping a Sign, and the Thing ſignified; or worſhipping the King and his Robes, which are very remote from the Buſineſs, and perplex and confound a Doctrine, which is very eaſy to be underſtood, and eaſily reſcued from thoſe Scholaſtick Abſurdities which are charged on it, if that were its only fault. For the true Repreſentation of it, is by conſidering the Nature of a Proxy, and legal Repreſentative, which acts in another's name and ſtead.

Having thus conſidered what is the Notion of Image-Worſhip, according to *Thomas*, and *Durandus*, and Monſieur *de Meaux*, that it is a worſhipping the Image in the name and ſtead of the Prototype, as its Proxy and Repreſentative, worſhipping the Image as repreſenting Chriſt, as *Thomas* ſpeaks, or worſhipping Chriſt before his Image as repreſented by it, as *Durandus* and M. *de Meaux* ſpeak. We have now ſome Foundation to build on; and I think they have no reaſon to complain that I have ſtated it in this manner, which grants them all they can deſire or ask for, *viz.* That they do not worſhip Images, as an Image ſignifies a Figure of Wood or Stone; but they worſhip the Image as repreſenting Chriſt; or if they like that better, Chriſt as repreſented in his Image; *That when they honour the Image of an Apoſtle or Martyr, they do not ſo much intend to honour the Image, as the Apoſtle or Martyr in the preſence of the Image.* Let us then conſider whether this will juſtify them; and if this will not, I doubt their Cauſe is deſperate. And in order to this, I ſhall do theſe three things.

1. Show

1. Show you, that this is the only intelligible Notion of worſhipping God, or Chriſt, or the Saints, by Images; that Images are a kind of legal Proxies and Repreſentatives, to receive our Worſhip in the name and ſtead of Chriſt, or the Saints.

2. That this is the Scripture Notion of Image-Worſhip; and that in this ſenſe it is the Scripture condemns the worſhip of Images, as practiſed by the Heathens.

3. I ſhall ſhow, wherein the Evil of worſhipping Images according to this Notion conſiſts.

1. That this is the only intelligible Notion of worſhipping God, or Chriſt, or the Saints, by Images; that Images are a kind of legal Proxies and Repreſentatives to receive our Worſhip in the name and ſtead of the Prototype, or the Being repreſented by them.

The Reaſon of worſhipping Images, is to do Honour to ſome Divine Being repreſented by theſe Images: for the true occaſion of Image-Worſhip, is that fondneſs Men have for a viſible Object of Worſhip; and becauſe they cannot ſee the Gods they worſhip, therefore they ſet up Images, as viſible and repreſentative Deities, to receive their Worſhip in the name and ſtead of their Gods. Now if we grant, that Men intend to worſhip their Gods, in that Worſhip they pay to, or before their Images, we muſt grant that theſe Images are inſtead of viſible Gods to them, or ſupply the place of their Gods, and receive Worſhip in their Names.

For to worſhip God, or any Divine Being, by an Image, can ſignify neither more nor leſs, than to worſhip God, or Chriſt, or the Saints, in that Worſhip which we give to their Images: for God cannot be worſhipped in an Image any otherwiſe, than as the Worſhip which is given to the Image is his Worſhip, and given in his Name: for *B* can be worſhipped in *A*, only as *A* is *B*'s Repreſentative, and is worſhipped in his name and ſtead. To worſhip any Being, is to worſhip his Perſon; and therefore we muſt either worſhip him in his own natural Perſon, or in his Repreſentative, who is his legal Perſon.

As to ſhew you this particularly.

If any Men were ever ſo ſottiſh as to believe their Images themſelves, that is, the viſible Figures of Wood, or Stone, or Braſs, to be Gods, and to worſhip them as Gods, ſuch Men cannot be ſaid to worſhip God by an Image, but to worſhip an Image-God; for the Image it ſelf is their God, and the Worſhip terminates on the Image as God. They may be ſaid to worſhip falſe Gods, Gods, in a ſtrict and proper ſenſe, of Wood and Stone; but to worſhip God by an Image, and to worſhip the Image it ſelf for a God, are very diſtinct things: and if the Scripture forbids the Worſhip of God by an Image, it will not juſtify Image-Worſhip, to ſay, that ſome Heathens were ſuch Sots, as to believe their Images themſelves to be Gods; for Men who are not ſuch Sots, may Worſhip their Gods by Images, as all thoſe Heathens did, who acknowledged their Images to be only Symbols and Repreſentations of their Gods, and therefore not to be Gods themſelves; for the ſame thing cannot be a Symbol and Repreſentation of it ſelf; which is as good ſenſe as to ſay, that a Sign, and the thing ſignified by it, is the ſame.

To give a proper, though inferiour degree of worſhip to Images themſelves, is not to worſhip God or Chriſt by his Image, becauſe in this caſe, the Worſhip they give to the Image of Chriſt, is not ſuch a Worſhip as is proper for Chriſt, and is terminated not on Chriſt, but on his Image. No Worſhip is proper to be given to Chriſt, but the Worſhip of *Latria*, or ſupream and ſoveraign Worſhip: but the Roman Doctors, who embrace this Opinion, deny with the ſecond Council of *Nice*, that *Latria* may be given to Images, and in general reject the Doctrine of *Thomas*, that the Image is to be worſhipped with the Worſhip due to the Prototype: And how then can Chriſt be worſhipped in his Image, if no Worſhip is given to the Image, which is fit for Chriſt to receive? when the Image has no Worſhip given it, but ſuch as is proper to its ſelf, conſidered as Chriſt's Image, will they call this the Worſhip of Chriſt? eſpecially ſince this Worſhip which is given to the Image, is terminated on the Image as its own proper and peculiar Worſhip, as *Ca-*

tharinus

tharinus and *Bellarmine*, and all of this way acknowledg; who reject *Thomas* his Doctrine of worſhipping the Image, with the worſhip of the Prototype repreſented by it, becauſe this is not properly the Worſhip of the Image, but of the Prototype; and therefore that the Image may be ſure to be worſhipped, they give it an inferior degree of Worſhip, which terminates on it ſelf. Now how Chriſt ſhould be worſhipped in that Worſhip which terminates on his Image; that is, how that Worſhip which ends in the Image, and goes no farther, ſhould paſs through the Image, and end in Chriſt, as it muſt do, if Chriſt be worſhipped in the Image, is paſt my underſtanding, as all Contradictions are.

But they refer the Worſhip of the Image to the Prototype. But it is worth enquiring how they do it; Do they intend the Worſhip they give to the Image for Chriſt? that is, Do they intend to worſhip Chriſt in that Worſhip they give to his Image? No: they can't do that, becauſe they give only an inferior degree of Worſhip to the Image, which is not worthy of Chriſt; not a Worſhip proper for him, but only for his Image: but they worſhip the Image for the ſake of Chriſt; and this they take to be an Honour to Chriſt to worſhip his Image: but this is not to worſhip Chriſt in or by his Image; for in this way Chriſt is not worſhipped in that Worſhip we give to his Image, but it is to worſhip the Image for Chriſt's ſake, which is, by interpretation, an Honour to Chriſt; as any reſpect we ſhow to the Image of the King, argues our Eſteem and Honour for our King, whoſe Image it is: but theſe two differ as much as to honour Chriſt in our Actions, and to worſhip him, as to do ſomething which is, by interpretation, an Honour to Chriſt, and to make our immediate Addreſſes, to offer up our Prayers and Thankſgivings to him. Every thing we do for the Honour of Chriſt, is not preſently an Act of Worſhip; and therefore though we ſhould grant, that we honour Chriſt in the Worſhip of his Image, it does not follow, that therefore we worſhip him in worſhipping his Image, when we give no Worſhip at all to him, but only to his Image; which plainly ſhows, that in this way they do not worſhip Chriſt by

by his Image, but only worſhip the Image for Chriſt's ſake. Which is a plain Argument to me, that though this Way has very great and learned Advocates, yet it cannot be the meaning of the Council of *Trent*, becauſe it is not reconcileable with the Practice of the Church of *Rome*; which prays every day to Chriſt, and the bleſſed Virgin, to Saints and Martyrs, before their Images, in ſuch terms as are proper only to be uſed to themſelves; which beſides the other Faults of it, is horrid Non-ſenſe, if they do not intend to worſhip Chriſt and the Saints in their Images.

Much leſs do thoſe worſhip the Prototypes in their Images, who only uſe Images as helps to Memory, and to excite devout Affections in them, that at the ſight of the Image they may offer up more fervent Prayers to God or Chriſt: for though this practice may and has a great many other Faults in it, yet this is neither in the intention of the Worſhipper, to worſhip the Image, nor the Exemplar by the Image. Monſieur *de Meaux*, by ſome Expreſſions he uſes, would perſwade his Readers, that this is all the Church of *Rome* intends in the uſe of Images; and yet he owns the Doctrine of the Council of *Trent*, *That the Honour of the Image is referred to the Prototype, becauſe by the Images which we kiſs, and before which we uncover our Heads, and proſtrate our ſelves, we adore Chriſt, and worſhip the Saints, whoſe Likeneſs they bear.* Which plainly ſignifies, that we worſhip Chriſt and the Saints in the worſhip of their Images; and therefore though Images may be helps to Memory alſo, yet they muſt be honoured and worſhipped, that Chriſt and his Saints may be worſhipped in them, and by them; which is a very different thing from being bare Signs to help our Memories, and quicken our Devotions. There is no need of Conſecration for this End; and the Church takes no notice of this uſe of them in her Forms of Conſecration. Theſe are all the Pretences I have met with for the uſe of Images in Religious Worſhip: and it is evident from what I have ſaid, that there is no other ſenſe, wherein God or Chriſt can be ſaid to be worſhipped by an Image, but only as the Image receives the Worſhip due to Chriſt in his Name and Stead, as if it were his legal Proxy and Repreſentative; which, as I

have shewed, is the true Interpretation, both of the Doctrine of *Durandus*, and Monsieur *de Meaux*, and *Thomas* in this Matter.

2*dly*. I am now to shew, that it is in this Notion the Scripture forbids the worship of Images, as the Representatives of God, or any Divine Being, to receive our Worship in God's Name and Stead. It is true indeed, the 2*d* Commandment, which forbids the worship of Images, takes no notice of the Distinctions of the Schools, in what Notion an Image is worshipped, or what kind and degree of Worship is given to it; but the words are so large and general, as to exclude all use of Images in Religious Worship. The Worship which is expresly forbidden in the Commandment to be given to Images, is only the External Acts of Worship, such as to bow down to them; which is the very least that can be done, if Men make any use of Images in Religious Worship: The Images which are forbidden to be worshipped, are all sorts of Images whatever; *The likeness of any Thing which is in Heaven above, or in the Earth beneath, or in the Water under the Earth.* And how extravagant soever Mens Fancies are, they cannot well form any Image, but must be like to some of these things, either in whole or in part. But the Commandment takes no notice of Mens different Opinions about Images, whether they look upon them as Gods, or Representatives of God, or helps to Memory and Devotion: for since the design of the Commandment is to forbid the use of Images in Religious Worship, it was dangerous to leave any room for Distinctions; which is to make every Man judg, what is an Innocent, and what is a sinful use of Images; which would utterly evacuate the Law: for Men of Wit can find out some Apology or other for the grossest Superstitions.

As for instance;

I find a notable Criticism in the Advertisement to Monsieur *de Meaux* his Exposition, (*p.* 14.) That *the Images forbidden in the second Commandment, are those which are forbidden to be made, as well as to be worshipped.* The Consequence of which is, That the Worship of such Images as may be lawfully made, is not forbidden in this Law; and then indeed

deed there is room enough for the Worſhip of Images: unleſs he will ſay, That it is unlawful to make the Images of any thing in Heaven or Earth, or under the Earth; but then they can have no Images to worſhip. *Tertullian* indeed, and ſome others, condemned the very Arts of Painting and Carving Images, as forbid in the ſecond Commandment: and it is certainly unlawful to make any Image in order to worſhip it. But I deſire to know of this Author, whether it be lawful to make an Image or Picture of the Sun, and Moon, and Planets; of Birds and Beaſts, of Men and Women, which are the Likeneſs of Things in Heaven, and Things on Earth? If it be, then the making of thoſe Images is not forbid in the ſecond Commandment, and then the worſhip of them is not forbid neither. But he ſays, He means ſuch Images *as are made to repreſent God, and thoſe which are made to ſhow him preſent, and which are worſhipped with the ſame intention as full of his Divinity.* But is this the Work of the Carver, or the Painter, to make a God? Can the Pencil, or the Knife, put Divinity into a Picture or Image? This is the work of him that Conſecrates, and him that Worſhips.

Qui fingit Sacros auro vel marmore vultus
Non facit ille Deos, qui colit, ille facit.

He had forgot the Brazen Serpent which *Hezekiah* broke, the making of which, I ſuppoſe, was not forbid in the ſecond Command, but it ſeems the worſhip of it was. But to return:

Though the ſecond Commandment forbids the worſhip of all ſorts of Images, and every act and degree of Worſhip, without leaving room for any Exceptions or Diſtinctions; yet we may learn from Scripture, what was the currant Notion of Image-Worſhip at that time, *viz.* That they worſhipped their Images, not for Gods, but for Symbols and Repreſentations of their Gods; that is, they ſet them up as viſible Objects of Worſhip, to receive their Worſhip in the name and ſtead of their Gods: They did not worſhip the Images themſelves, but their Gods in and by their Images.

Indeed, this is the only Notion of Image-Worſhip that any Men ever had, till Chriſtians began to worſhip Images, and then were forced to defend it, and to diſtinguiſh away the Idolatry of it.

This is the Account the Heathens gave of their Worſhip of Images, That they did not believe them to be Gods, but only worſhipped their Gods in their Images. Thus *Cicero* aſcribes the making Images of their Gods in humane Shape, to their Superſtition, *Ut eſſent ſimulacra, quæ venerantes deos ipſos ſe adire crederent*, that they might have Images to make their Addreſſes to, as if the Gods themſelves were preſent. And *Maximus Tyrius* gives a large Account of their Images to the ſame purpoſe, That they are all but ſo many Pictures and Repreſentations of the Deity, to bring us to the conception of him; and it matters not what the Image be, ſo it bring God to our Thoughts, and direct our Worſhip to him; θεῖον εἰς ζνώμλω ἔχω μόνον. *Celſus* and *Julian* deny that they thought their Images to be Gods; and ſo did the Heathens in *Arnobius*, *Athanaſius*, and St. *Auſtin*, as thoſe Fathers acknowledg. And *Julian* tells us, That a lover of God loves the Repreſentations of the Gods; and beholding their Images, doth ſecretly fear and reverence them, which although inviſible themſelves, do behold him. And *Dio Chryſoſtom*, in his Olympick Oration, gives this Account why Men are ſo fond of Images, which they know cannot expreſs the inviſible and inexpreſſible Nature of God, *Becauſe Mankind doth not love to worſhip God at a diſtance, but to come near and feel him, and with aſſurance Sacrifice to him, and Crown him.* Nay, thoſe very Heathens who believed that ſome inviſible Spirits after Conſecration were, not incorporated with their Images, (which it does not appear to me, that any of them thought) but preſent in them; did not therefore worſhip the material Figure, but through the viſible Image, worſhipped thoſe inviſible Spirits which were hid in it. *Non hoc viſibile colo, ſed numen quod illic inviſibiliter habitat.* And therefore *Arnobius* ſays, That they formed the Images of their Gods, *Vicariâ ſubſtitutione*, that is, to ſet them in the place of God, to be a vicarious Object of Worſhip, to receive their Worſhip in the name of their Gods;

De Natura deorum, l. 1. c. 27.

Max. Tyrius, diſſert. 38.

See Dr. Stillingfleet's *Defence of the Diſcourſe of Idolatry*, p. 466, &c.

Dio Chryſ. Orat. 12.

St. Aug. in Pſal. 113.

Arnob. l. 6.

Gods; and that God receives their Worſhip by Images, *per quædam fidei commiſſa*, by way of Truſt; as if they were intruſted to receive their Worſhip for God in his ſtead. Hence St. *Auſtin* tells us, that no Image of God ought to be worſhipped, but only Chriſt, who is what he is; and he not to be worſhipped *inſtead of God*, but together with him; which ſhows plainly what Notion the Father had of proper Image-worſhip; that it is to worſhip the Image inſtead of God: and therefore tho Chriſt be ſuch an Image of God as muſt be worſhipped, yet he muſt not be worſhipped as an Image; that is, not in the ſtead, but together with God. And St. *Hierom* on *Rom.* 1. gives the ſame notion of Image-worſhip, *Quomodo inviſibilis Deus per ſimulacrum viſibile colere-tur*; that it is to worſhip the inviſible God by a viſible Image: and therefore falling down before their Images is called by *Arnobius*, *Deorum ante ora proſtrati*, proſtrating themſelves before the Face of their Gods; which is aptly expreſſed by *Cæſar*, *ante ſimulacra projecti victoriam a Diis expoſcerent*, falling down before their Images, they begged Victory of their Gods. And in thoſe days before they were acquainted with School-Diſtinctions, to pray to their Gods before their Images, and fixing their Eyes on them, was thought to be Image-worſhip; thus St. *Auſtin* expreſſes it by *adorat vel orat intuens ſimulacrum*, adoring, or praying, looking upon an Image: and ſo does *Ovid*, *Summiſſoq; genu vultus in imagine Divæ fixit*, with bended Knees he fixes his Eye upon the Image of the Goddeſs: and indeed all the Arguments of the ancient Fathers againſt the Worſhip of Images are levelled againſt this Notion of it, that they worſhipped their Gods by Images, not that they thought their Images to be Gods. This then being the received Notion of Image-worſhip among the Heathens, in which they all agreed, as far as we have any account of their Opinions, and being the only intelligible account that can be given of the Worſhip of Images, we have reaſon to believe, that the ſecond Commandment, which forbids the Worſhip of Images, had a principal regard to it; but I have other Arguments from the Scripture it ſelf to confirm this Opinion.

Aug. Ep. 119. c. 11.

Arn. l. 1.

Cæſar de Bello Civ. l. 2.

Ovid. Faſt. 4.

1. The

1. The first is from the first Example of Image-worship among the *Israelites* after the giving this Law; that is, the Worship of the Golden Calf, which *Aaron* made while *Moses* was in the Mount: That this Calf was intended only as a Symbolical Representation of the God of *Israel*, and that they worshipped the Lord *Jehovah* in the Worship of this Calf, is so evident from the whole Story, that I confess I do not think that Man fit to be disputed with, who denies it; for he must either want Understanding, or Honesty, to be convinced of the plainest matter, which he has no mind to believe. The occasion of their making this Calf, was the absence of *Moses*, who was a kind of a living Oracle, and Divine Presence with them. They said to *Aaron*, Exod. 32. 1. *Up, make us Gods, which shall go before us: for as for this* Moses, *the Man who brought us up out of the Land of* Egypt, *we wot not what is become of him:* So that they wanted not a new God, but only a Divine Presence with them, since *Moses*, who used to acquaint them with the Will of God, and govern them by a Divine Spirit, was so long absent, that they thought him lost; when the Calf was made, *they said, These be thy Gods, O Israel, which brought Thee out of the Land of Egypt:* Which they could not possibly understand of the Calf, which was but then made. For tho we should think them so silly, as to believe it to be a God, it was impossible they should think that the Calf brought them out of *Egypt*, before it self was made: Nor could they think any Egyptian Gods delivered them out of *Egypt* to the ruine and desolation of their own Country; especially, since they certainly knew, that it was only the Lord *Jehovah*, who brought them out of *Egypt* by the hand of *Moses*; and therefore *Aaron built an Altar before it, and proclaimed a Feast to the Lord, or to Jehovah*, as the word is: which makes it very plain to any unprejudiced Man, that they intended to worship the Lord *Jehovah* in the Worship of the Golden Calf, which they made for a symbolical Representation and Presence of God; which no doubt was very agreeable to the notion the Egyptians had of their Images, from whom they learn'd this way of Worship; and I need not tell any Man how displeasing this was to God.

See Dr. Stillingfl. *Defence of Disc. of Idolatry, p. 747, &c*

2. Ano-

2. Another Argument of this, is, That Images are called Gods in Scripture; *Iſa.* 44. 10. *Who hath faſhioned a God, or molten a Graven Image, which is profitable for nothing.——He maketh a God and worſhippeth it; he maketh it a Graven Image, and falleth down thereto.——The reſidue thereof he maketh a God, even his Graven Image, and worſhippeth it, and prayeth unto it, and ſaith, Deliver me, for thou art my God.* I need not multiply places for the proof of this; for this is own'd by all the Advocates of the Church of *Rome*, and relied on as the great ſupport of their Cauſe. From hence they ſay, it is plain in what ſenſe God forbids the Worſhip of Images, *viz.* when Men worſhip their Images for Gods, as the Text aſſerts the Heathens did. But tho the Church of *Rome* worſhips Images, yet ſhe does not worſhip them for Gods, but only worſhip God, or Chriſt, or the Saints in and by their Images. This is the reaſon of their great Zeal to make the firſt and ſecond Commandment but one: becauſe the firſt Commandment forbidding the Worſhip of all falſe Gods, If that which we call the ſecond Commandment, which forbids the Worſhip of Images, be reckoned only as part of the firſt, then they think it plain in what ſenſe the Worſhip of Images is forbid *viz.* only as the Worſhip of falſe Gods; and therefore thoſe cannot be charged with the breach of this Commandment, who do not believe their Images to be Gods. Iſa. 44. 10, 15, 17.

Now beſides what I have already ſaid, to prove that the Heathens did not believe the Images themſelves to be Gods, which is ſo ſottiſh a Conceit, as no Man of common Senſe can be guilty of; I have ſeveral Arguments to prove, that the Scripture does not underſtand it in this ſenſe.

1. The firſt is, That the Golden Calf is called *Gods of Gold*, *Exod.* 32. 31. and yet it is evident, they did not believe the Calf to be a God, but only a Symbol and Repreſentation of the Lord *Jehovah*, whom they worſhipped in the Calf.

2. The very name of an Image, which ſignifies a Likeneſs and Repreſentation of ſome other Being, is irreconcileable with ſuch a Belief, that the Image it ſelf is a God; that the Image is that very God, whom it is made to repreſent; which

which ſignifies, that the likeneſs of God, is that very God whoſe likeneſs it is: Eſpecially, when the Scripture, which calls ſuch Images Gods, calls them alſo the Images of their Gods.

Which is proof enough, that tho the Scripture calls Images Gods, it does not underſtand it in that ſenſe, that they believe their material Images to be Gods: for it is a contradiction to ſay, that the Image of *Baal*, is both their God *Baal*, and his Image at the ſame time; for the Image is not the thing it repreſents.

3. The Arguments urged in Scripture againſt Images, plainly prove, that they were not made to be Gods, but only Repreſentations of God. One Argument is, becauſe they ſaw no ſimilitude of God when he ſpoke to them in *Horeb* out of the midſt of the Fire: another, that they can make no likeneſs of Him. *To whom then will ye liken God, or what likeneſs will ye compare to Him? ——To whom then will ye liken Me, or ſhall I be equal, ſaith the Holy One?* Thus St. *Paul* argues with the Philoſophers at *Athens*; *For as much then as we are the Off-ſpring of God, we ought not to think the Godhead to be like to Gold, and Silver, and Stone graven by Art, and Man's Device.* Now what do all theſe Arguments ſignify againſt making a God? for if they can make a God, what matter is it who their God be like, ſo he be a God? It is a good Argument againſt making any Image and Repreſentation of God, that it is impoſſible to make any thing like him; but it is enough for a God to be like it ſelf.

Deut. 4. 15.

Iſa. 40. 18, 27.

Acts 17. 29.

In what ſenſe then, you'l ſay, does the Scripture call Images Gods? there is but one poſſible ſenſe, that I know of, and that is, that they are vicarious and ſubſtituted Gods; that they are ſet up in God's place, to repreſent his Perſon, and to receive our Worſhip in his name and ſtead, and ſo are Gods by Office, tho not by Nature. They are viſible Repreſentations of the Inviſible God, they bear his Name and receive his Worſhip; as the Golden Calf was called *Jehovah*, and the Worſhip of the Calf was called a Feaſt unto the Lord: And this is ſome reaſon for their being called Gods; as the Proxy and Subſtitute acts in the name of the Perſonhe repreſents: Which proves that this is the Scripture

ture notion of Image-worſhip, that the Image is worſhipped in God's name and ſtead. And to this purpoſe I obſerve, That tho' εἴδωλον, or an Idol, ſignifies a falſe god; yet it ſignifies ſuch a falſe god as is only the image and figure of another god; for ſo εἴδωλον, ſignifies εἶκον and ὁμοίωμα, a likeneſs or ſimilitude. Thus *Tertullian* tells us, *eorum imagines Idola, imaginum conſecratio Idolatria.* That their Images are Idols, and the Conſecration of them is Idolatry. Thus the Author of the Book of Wiſdom attributes the original of Idolatry, *to Fathers making images for their children who were dead, and appointing ſolemnities to be kept before them as if they were gods; and thus by degrees Princes paſſed theſe things into Laws, and made men to worſhip graven images; and thus either out of affection or flattery the worſhip of Idols began.* Which ſhews what he means by Idols, Images conſecrated for the worſhip of God. And therefore he diſtinguiſhes the worſhip of Idols, from the worſhip of the Elements and heavenly bodies, when this was done without an Image: And therefore no God is in Scripture called an Idol, but with reſpect to its Image. Thus Idols and Molten Gods are join'd together, as expounding each other. And the Pſalmiſt tells us, *The Idols of the Heathens are Silver and Gold, the work of mens hands.* So that an Idol is a falſe God, as it ſignifies a material Image made to repreſent ſome God, as a viſible object of worſhip, to receive the worſhip of that God whoſe name it bears, in his place and ſtead.

Tertul. de Idolo. c. 4.

Wiſdom c 14. v. 15.

c. 13. v. 6.

Levit. 19.4. Pſalm. 135.15.

To the ſame purpoſe the Scripture charges theſe Image-worſhippers with changing the Glory of God into the likeneſs and ſimilitude of thoſe creatures whereby they repreſented him. The *Iſraelites* made the Image of a Golden Calf, as the ſymbolical repreſentation and preſence of the Lord Jehovah; and the Pſalmiſt tells us, that by ſo doing, *they changed their glory* (*i. e.* the Lord *Jehovah*, who was the glory of *Iſrael*) *into the ſimilitude of an Ox which eateth graſs.* Which neceſſarily ſuppoſes, that they intended to repreſent the Lord *Jehovah* in the Image of the Calf; not that they thought their God to be like the Calf, but as they made a vicarious and viſible God of it, and worſhipped it in the name of the Lord *Jehovah*. Thus St. *Paul* deſcribes the Idolatry of the Heathens, *That they changed the glory of the incorruptible God, into an image made like to corruptible*

Rom 1.23.

ruptible man, and four footed beasts, and creeping things. But of this more presently; this is sufficient to show, what the Scripture notion of Image-worship is, and in what sense it condemns it.

3*dly.* Let us now consider wherein the evil of this Image-worship consists, which will greatly contribute to the right understanding of this whole dispute. Now the account of it in general is very short and plain, That the evil of Image-worship when we worship the true God by an Image, does not so much consist in the kinds, or degrees, or object of worship, as in representation; and if this prove the true account of it, as I believe it will appear to be to all considering men, before I have done, it will quite alter the state of this controversie, and put M. *de Meaux*, and the Representer, to find out some new Expositions and Representations of their Image-worship.

1. That the evil of Image-worship when men worship the true God by an Image, does not principally consist in the kinds, or degrees, or object of worship. Such men indeed are said in Scripture to worship Images, and Idols, and Molten Gods, and that their Idols are silver and gold, wood and stone; for when they worship God by an Image, they must worship the Image; or else they cannot worship God in it, tho' they worship the Image not for it self, but for the Ptototype, as the Council of *Trent* determines, which is more properly worshipping God or Christ in or before his Image, as M. *de Meaux* expounds it, than worshipping the Image; and they are said to worship Images rather with respect to the manner than to the object of worship, as you shall hear more presently. The Church of *Rome* indeed, as her doctrine and practice is expounded by her most famed Divines, may justly be charged with worshipping Images in the grossest sense; as that signifies giving Religious worship to the material image of wood and stone; which is strictly to worship stocks and stones as Gods. This charge may be easily made good against all those who teach that the Image is to be properly worshipped, and that either a relative *latria*, or some proper inferior worship is to be terminated on the Image as its material object; and yet most of the *Roman* Doctors attribute one or t'other to the Image, as distinct from that worship they give to the Prototype; and dispute very learnedly, that this is the

the Doctrine both of the ſecond Council of *Nice*, and of the Council of *Trent*, That a proper worſhip muſt be given to the Image, diſtinct from that worſhip which is given to the Prototype; but they cannot yet agree, whether it be a relative improper analogical *latria*, which muſt be given to the Image of Chriſt, or only *dulia*, or an inferiour degree of Religious worſhip.

This has hitherto been the chief ſeat of the Controverſy between *Proteſtants* and *Papiſts* about Image-worſhip; and M. *de Meaux* ſeems very ſenſible, That attributing a proper worſhip to Images, ſo as to terminate it on them, gives too juſt occaſion for the charge of Idolatry, and puts them to hard ſhifts to vindicate themſelves from it; and therefore he owns no worſhip due to the Image for it ſelf, but only as it repreſents the Prototype, which therefore is not ſo properly the worſhip of the Image, as of the Prototype by the Image; and here I perfectly agree with him, That the true notion of Image-worſhip is not to worſhip the Image at all, conſidered in it ſelf, as a material figure of Wood and Stone, but only to worſhip God or Chriſt in the Image. And therefore I ſhall ſet aſide this diſpute, in what ſenſe, or how far a *Papiſt* may be charged with worſhipping the material Image, which has occaſioned eternal wranglings, and yet does not properly belong to the controverſie of Image-worſhip. To worſhip a material Image, is to give the worſhip of God to Creatures, to Wood and Stone; but Image-worſhip is in its ſtrict notion, not giving Divine worſhip to Images, but worſhipping God in and by the Image which repreſents him, which in Scripture is called worſhipping Images: And therefore tho we ſhould grant, that M. *de Meaux* his expoſition avoids the firſt charge of giving Religious worſhip to Wood and Stone, becauſe he denies that they properly worſhip the Image, but only the Prototype in the Image; yet the whole guilt of Image-worſhip, as that ſignifies the worſhip of God by Images, not the worſhip of the material Image, is chargeable upon him ſtill, that is, the worſhip of the Prototype by the Image, which is all that is forbid in the ſecond Commandment.

This, it may be, will be thought a giving up the Cauſe, to grant, that the Church of *Rome* may worſhip God or Chriſt

by Images, and yet not be chargeable with worſhipping the Images themſelves, or the material figures of Wood or Stone; and therefore it will be neceſſary to ſhew, that the true Notion of Idolatry or Image-worſhip is not giving Religious worſhip to the Images themſelves, but worſhipping God by Images, and what the difference between theſe Two is.

1. And the firſt thing I ſhall obſerve to this purpoſe, is the difference between the Firſt and Second Commandment, which all *Proteſtants* own and defend againſt the Church of *Rome*, which makes the Second Commandment only a Branch and Appendix of the Firſt. Now the Firſt Commandment forbids all falſe objects of worſhip, the worſhip of all creatures and fictitious Deities, and therefore the worſhip of all Beings beſides God, whether rational, animate or inanimate, is a breach of the Firſt Commandment, and muſt be reduced to it; and conſequently the Second Commandment which forbids the worſhip of Images, cannot forbid them as falſe Objects, (for all ſuch are forbid in the firſt Commandment) but as a falſe and corrupt way of worſhip; and therefore Image worſhip as it is forbid in the Second Commandment, cannot ſignifie worſhipping the Image it ſelf, as diſtinguiſhed from the Prototype, for that would make it a falſe object of worſhip againſt the firſt Commandment; but only a falſe and ſuperſtitious way of repreſenting and worſhipping God by an Image.

2*ly*. And therefore I obſerve, that an Image does not alter the object of worſhip, which yet it muſt neceſſarily do, if it were Eſſential to the Notion of Image-worſhip to worſhip the Image it ſelf, which would make the Image a new object of worſhip. Now it is plain, that men who do not diſpute themſelves into endleſs ſubtilties and diſtinctions, intend no more in the worſhip of Images, than to worſhip that God whoſe Image it is, and therefore the object of worſhip is the ſame with or without an Image. They who worſhip the True God with an Image, and they who worſhip him without an Image, worſhip the ſame God though in a different manner; and beſides what judgment men make of their own actions, and what they intend to do, the Scripture it ſelf acknowledges this. When the *Iſraelites* made a golden Calf, *Aaron* proclaims a Feaſt to the Lord Jehovah, which proves that they intended to worſhip the ſame God ſtill in the golden

golden Calf, which they did before without it. Thus the Two Calves which *Jeroboam* ſet up, were made in imitation of the golden Calf, and for Symbolical repreſentations of the God of *Iſrael*, who was worſhipped by them; For it is plain that *Jeroboam* did not intend to change their God, but only to prevent their going up to *Jeruſalem* to worſhip God there; and therefore he tells them, *It is too much for you to go up to* Jeruſalem, *behold thy Gods*, O Iſrael, *which brought thee up out of the Land of Egypt*; that is, the Lord Jehovah. Now we may obſerve, that God himſelf, though he was grievouſly offended with the Sin of *Jeroboam*, yet he makes a great difference between the Sin of *Jeroboam* and the Sin of *Ahab*, who introduced the worſhip of *Baal* a falſe God, whereas *Jeroboam* retained the worſhip of the true God, though he worſhipped him in a falſe and Idolatrous manner. If the Calves of *Dan* and *Bethel* had been falſe Gods, as *Baal* was, the Sin had been equally provoking; but the worſhip of the Calves did not change their God, as the worſhip of *Baal* did; and therefore *Elijah* diſtinguiſhes the *Iſraelites* into the worſhippers of God and of *Baal*. *How long halt ye between Two Opinions? if the Lord be God, follow him; but if* Baal, *then follow him*; and yet moſt of thoſe who are ſaid to be worſhippers of God, did worſhip God at the Calves of *Dan* and *Bethel*, which was the eſtabliſhed Religion of the Kingdom. And thus *Jehu*, tho' he departed not from the Sin of *Jeroboam*, the golden Calves in *Dan* and *Bethel*, yet he calls his Zeal in deſtroying *Baal* out of *Iſrael*, his Zeal for the Lord Jehovah.

1 King. 12.28.

1 King. 16. 31, 32.

1 King. 18. 21.

2 King. 10. 16.

Now if the worſhip of an Image do not change the object of our worſhip, neither in the intention of the worſhipper, nor in the account of Scripture, as I have now proved, it evidently follows, that the Image is not worſhipped as an object, but as a *Medium* of worſhip; it receives no worſhip for it ſelf, but only for God whom it repreſents. And that which is ſo offenſive to God in it, is not that they ſet up any Rival and Oppoſite gods againſt him, but that they worſhip him in a reproachful and diſhonourable manner, which makes him abhor and reject the worſhip; and becauſe he will not receive this worſhip himſelf, he calls it worſhipping Idols and graven Images, and molten gods, that is, vicarious and repreſentative gods, which though they receive the worſhip in God's Name, yet are an infinite reproach

to

to his Majeſty by that vile and contemptible Repreſentation they make him. This is the ſtrict Notion of Idolatry, not the giving the worſhip of God to Creatures; which is the Breach of the Firſt Commandment in making new Gods, but the worſhip of God by an Image, which makes ſuch Images Gods by Repreſentation, but not the objects, but only the *Medium* of worſhip; and therefore though we ſhould grant M. *de Meaux* that he does not worſhip Images, but only Chriſt and the Saints in or before their Images, this does not excuſe him from Idolatry, which does not ſignifie worſhipping an Image in a ſtrict ſence; but only worſhipping God in an Image, which terminates all the worſhip not on the Image but on God.

2*ly*. Let us now conſider wherein the Evil of this Idolatry or Image-worſhip does conſiſt; and that I ſaid was in Repreſentation; which I ſhall briefly explain in theſe particulars. 1. That it is an infinite reproach to the Divine Nature and Perfections, to be repreſented by an Image: *To whom will ye liken God? Or what likeneſs will ye compare to him? The workman melteth a graven-Image, and the Goldſmith ſpreadeth it over with Gold, and caſteth Silver Chains. He that is ſo impoveriſhed that he hath no Oblation, chuſeth a Tree that will not rot: he ſeeketh unto him a cunning Workman to prepare a graven Image that ſhall not be moved. Have ye not known? Have ye not heard? Hath it not been told you from the beginning? Have ye not underſtood from the Foundations of the Earth? It is he that ſitteth upon the Circle of the Earth, and the Inhabitants thereof are as Graſhoppers; that ſtretcheth out the Heavens as a Curtain, and ſpreadeth them out as a Tent to dwell in.* How incongruous and abſurd is it, to make a Picture or Image of that God who is inviſible? to repreſent a pure Mind by Matter, dull ſenſleſs Matter! to give the ſhape and figure of a Man, or ſome viler Creature, to that God who has none! To make an Image for the Maker of the World, and to bring that Infinite Being to the ſcantlings and dimenſions of a Man, who fills Heaven and Earth with his preſence! If it be the Glory of God to be what he is, a pure, infinite, eternal, inviſible Mind! it is a contradiction and diſhonour to him to be repreſented by a material viſible Image like to ſome of his own Creatures, but inferior to the meaneſt living Creatures, becauſe without Life and Senſe: Thus St. *Paul* argues, *Acts* 17.29.

Iſa. 40. 18, 19, &c.

For-

Foraſmuch then as we are the off-ſpring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto Gold or Silver, or Stone graven by art, and mans device. If we think God to be like to ſuch Images, we know nothing of him; and if we make ſuch Images as we know are not like to God, nay a reproach to his Nature and Perfections, we wilfully affront him. And tho Chriſt converſed in this World in human Nature, which is repreſentable by an Image, yet an Image is not a proper Repreſentation of Chriſt, as the object of Worſhip, becauſe it cannot repreſent the Divine Nature, which is the Reaſon and Foundation of Worſhip. And as for Saints, they ought not to be worſhipped at all, and therefore not worſhipped by Images: And indeed, that very Law which forbids the worſhip of Images without any Exception, and yet upon ſuch Reaſons as are peculiar to the infinite Nature of God, are a plain Argument to me, that no Being which is repreſentable by human Art, is an Object of Worſhip.

2. To ſet up an Image in the place of God, has a great appearance and ſuſpicion of worſhipping a material and viſible God, of giving Divine Honours to Gold and Silver, and the work of mens hands; for tho men pretend to Worſhip God in the Image, yet how does the Image come to be worſhipped for God? What likeneſs? What Relation is there between them? How eaſily may men ſlip into the worſhip of Images themſelves, and forſake God, or never mind him, for the ſake of a fine Picture, or ſome beautiful or wonder-working Image? for tho there is a great deal of difference between worſhipping God by an Image, and worſhipping the Image it ſelf, yet to all appearance they are ſo like one another, and there is ſo eaſie a paſſage from one to the other, that Gods diſpleaſure againſt this Sin is expreſſed in Scripture by Jealouſie, a Paſſion which expreſſes both Suſpicion and Caution; while they profeſs to Worſhip God by their Images, they do not change their God, but yet their worſhipping a viſible Image, looks very like it, and is an eaſie introduction to it. Thus in the ſecond Commandment, the Reaſon with which God inforces his Prohibition againſt worſhipping Images is, *For I the Lord thy God, am a Jealous God.* Thus Pſal. 78. 58. *for they provoked him to anger with their high places, and moved him to jealouſie with their graven Images.* And therefore he expreſſes

preſſes himſelf with ſome Paſſion and Concernment in this matter. *I am the Lord, that is my Name, and my Glory will I not give to another, neither my Praiſe to Graven Images*, Iſa. 42. 8. The Church is called Gods Spouſe, and the worſhip of falſe gods is called Whoredom and Adultery, going after other gods; and the worſhip of the true God by Images, tho it be not Whoredom, yet it is ſuch a kind of ſpiritual Wantonneſs and Incontinency, as excites his Jealouſie.

3. Eſpecially when we conſider, that the Worſhip of Images does naturally expoſe us to the Cheats and Impoſtures of wicked Spirits; for this reaſon I obſerved before, God forbids the Worſhip of any other Inviſible Being but himſelf; for if men were allowed to Worſhip inferior Spirits, bad Spirits who inhabit theſe lower Regions, would ſoon have the greateſt ſhare in their Worſhip; and thus it is with Images, which are ſuch an offence and diſhonour to God, that we cannot expect that he will ever ſhow himſelf preſent in them, or guard them from the poſſeſſion of evil Spirits. It is evident that in the Heathen World, evil Spirits poſſeſſed their Images, and abuſed mankind with their lying Wonders, and lying Oracles; and I have ſome reaſon to believe, that if any Miracles are wrought ſtill at Images, they are not by good Spirits, becauſe Images are an Abomination to God; and therefore, *Rom.* 1. St. *Paul* attributes the general corruption of mens lives and manners to the Worſhip of Images; *They changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds and fourfooted beaſts, and creeping things; wherefore God gave them up to uncleanneſs—for this cauſe God gave them up to vile affections—and even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind to do theſe things which are not convenient.* The meaning of which is, That God gave them over to the deluſions of wicked Spirits, who lurked in their Images, and firſt corrupted their Religion, and then their Lives by impure and barbarous Rites of Worſhip.

4. If there were no other hurt in Image-worſhip, yet it debaſes human Nature to fall down before a ſenſleſs Image: As it is a diſhonour to God to be worſhipped by an Image, tho the Worſhip be intended for himſelf, and not for the Image, becauſe it makes ſo mean and vile Repreſentation of him; ſo it is a reproach

proach to a man, who is a reaſonable Creature, and made after the Image of God, to fall down before Stocks and Stones, with all external Submiſſions and Adorations, tho he intends not to worſhip the material Image, but God by it; becauſe the viſible Object before which we pay our Worſhip, is ſo much below the honour and dignity of humane Nature, is a reproach to the underſtanding of a man to think that a material Image is a decent Repreſentation of God, and a fit medium of Worſhip; and he muſt have a mean and beggarly Spirit, who can be contented to bow down before it: Thus *Arnobius* aggravates the madneſs of this: Supplicare tremebundum factitatæ abs te rei; *To fall down trembling, and to ſupplicate that which thou thy ſelf haſt made.* And a greater than *Arnobius* tells us, *They that make them, are like unto them, ſo is every one who putteth their truſt in them.* Arnob. l. 6. Pſal. 135. 18.

5*ly*. The Worſhip of God by Images is contrary not only to the Law of *Moſes*, but to the reaſon of Mankind; it gratifies indeed a fleſhly and ſenſual Mind to have a viſible Object of Worſhip, but God is the only natural Object of Worſhip; and reaſon tells us, that God is inviſible; and Reaſon will tell us, that it is contrary to the nature of an inviſible Being, to be worſhipped under a viſible Repreſentation; it is not only a Reproach to the Divine Nature, but an abſurd and unreaſonable Worſhip. For what conſidering man can think it reaſonable to worſhip a viſible Image inſtead of an inviſible God? Reaſon can never juſtifie a worſhip ſo contradictory to the Divine Nature, and therefore Reaſon can never teach men to Worſhip an Image. For what is it they intend by worſhipping Images? Have they a mind to ſee the God they Worſhip? But how unreaſonable is this, when they know he is inviſible, and would not be a God if he could be ſeen? And how abſurd is it to Repreſent him by an Image, when they know they can make no Image like him? No worſhip can be natural, which contradicts the nature of that Being whom we Worſhip; and if it be not natural, it muſt be inſtituted Worſhip; and then, tho it were forbid by no Law, it muſt be commanded by ſome Law to make it reaſonable, at leaſt if it be poſſible that a Law could make that an act of Honour and Worſhip, which is a Diſhonour to the Divine Perfections.

6*ly*. It is more eſpecially contrary to the nature of the Chriſtian worſhip, which teaches us to form a more ſpiritual Idea of God, and to worſhip him in Spirit and in Truth; in oppoſition not only to all ſenſible Repreſentations, but to all ſymbolical Preſences. There are two things principally, for which Images are intended, to be viſible Repreſentations, and a viſible Preſence of the Deity. The firſt of theſe is ſo great a Reproach to the Divine Nature, that it was forbid by the Law of *Moſes*, which was at beſt a leſs perfect Diſpenſation, as being accommodated to the carnal State of that people; but as to the ſecond, God himſelf gratified them in it, for he dwelt among them in the Tabernacle, and afterwards in the Temple of *Jeruſalem*, where he placed the Symbols of his Preſence. But now when the Woman of *Samaria* asked our Saviour about the place of Worſhip, whether it was the Temple at *Jeruſalem*, or *Samaria*: He anſwers, *The hour cometh when ye ſhall neither in this mountain, nor yet at* Jeruſalem *worſhip the Father. But the true worſhippers ſhall worſhip the Father in Spirit and in Truth, for the Father ſeeketh ſuch to worſhip him. God is a Spirit, and they that worſhip him, muſt worſhip him in Spirit and in Truth.* Where Chriſt oppoſes worſhipping in Spirit and in Truth, to worſhipping in the Temple, not as a Temple ſignifies a place ſeparated for Religious Worſhip, which is a neceſſary Circumſtance of Worſhip in all Religions; but as it ſignifies a Symbolical Preſence, a Figure of Gods Reſidence and Dwelling among them, in which ſenſe the Primitive Chriſtians denied that they had any Temples. For God dwelling in human Nature, is the only Divine Preſence under the Goſpel, of which the Temple was but a Type and Figure. Now if the ſpiritual Worſhip of the Goſpel does ſo withdraw us from ſenſe, as not to admit of a Symbolical Preſence, much leſs certainly does it admit of Images, to repreſent God preſent to us, which is ſo groſs and carnal, that God forbad it under the Legal Diſpenſation. We muſt conſider God as an infinite Mind, preſent in all places to hear our Prayers, and receive our Worſhip, and muſt raiſe our hearts to Heaven, whither Chriſt who is the only viſible Preſence of God is aſcended, and not ſeek for him in carved Wood or Stone, or a curious piece of Painting.

Joh 4. 21, 23, 24.

7*ly*. But

7*ly*. But ſince M. *de Maux*, and the Repreſenter think it ſufficient to juſtifie the worſhip of Images, that they are of great uſe to repreſent the object of our worſhip to us, and to affect us with ſuitable paſſions; it will be needful briefly to conſider this matter. For I confeſs I cannot ſee how a material and viſible Image ſhould form a true Idea in us of an inviſible Spirit; it is apt to corrupt mens notions of God and Religion, and to abate our juſt reverence, by repreſenting the object of our worſhip under ſo contemptible an appearance. An Image cannot tell us what God is; if we are otherwiſe inſtructed in the nature of God, we know that an image is not like him, but a reproach to the Divine perfections; if we are not better inſtructed, we ſhall think our God like his image, which will make us very underſtanding Chriſtians.

But the *Repreſenter* has drawn this Argument out at large, and therefore we muſt conſider what he ſays of it. That Pictures and Images ſerve to, 1. *Preſerve in his mind the memory of the things repreſented by them, as people are wont to preſerve the memory of their deceaſed Friends by keeping their Pictures.* But I beſeech you, the memory of what does a Picture preſerve? Of nothing that I know of, but the external lineaments and features of the face or body; and therefore the Images and Pictures of God and the Holy Trinity (which yet are allowed in the Church of *Rome*) cannot ſerve this end, unleſs they will ſay, that God has an external ſhape as Man has. And ſuppoſe we had the exact Pictures of Chriſt and the Virgin *Mary*, the Apoſtles and other Saints and Martyrs, this might gratifie our curioſity, but of what uſe is it in the Chriſtian Religion? To remember Chriſt, is not to remember his face, which we never ſaw, but to remember his Doctrine and his Life; to call to mind his great Love in dying for us; to remember him not as a Man, but as a God incarnate, as our Mediator and Advocate, as our Lord and Judge; and therefore the Goſpels which contain the Hiſtory of his Life, are a much better Picture of Chriſt, than any drawn by the moſt curious Pencil; and I doubt, the Chriſtian Religion will not gain much by taking the Goſpels out of peoples hands, and giving them a Picture to gaze on.

Yes, says our Author, 2. *He is taught to use them by casting his eye upon the Pictures or Images, and thence to raise his heart to the Prototypes, and there to imploy it in Meditation, Love, Thanksgiving, Imitation,* &c. *as the object requires.* But he is a very sorry Christian, who never thinks of Christ, but when he sees his Picture. And how can the sight of a Picture raise our hearts to the Love of Christ? The sight indeed of a lovely Picture may excite a sensible passion, but not a Divine Love; The sight of his Picture can only put us in mind, that there was such a person as Christ in the world; but if we would affect our hearts with his love and praise, we must not gaze on his Face, which is all that a Picture can show us, if it could do that; but meditate on what he has done and suffered for us, which may be done better without a Picture, than with it. If they want something to put them in mind, that there is such a person as Christ, which is all that his Picture can do, the name of Christ written upon the Church Walls would be more innocent, and altogether as effectual to this end.

But Pictures are very instructive, as that of *a Deaths head* and *Old Time painted with his Forelock, Hour-glass, and Sythe; and do inform the mind at one glance, of what in reading requires a Chapter, and sometimes a Volume*; Which is so far from being true, that a Picture informs a Man of nothing, but what he was informed of before. The Picture of a Crucifix may put a man in Mind of what he has heard or read of Christs dying upon the Cross; but if he know nothing of the History of Christs Sufferings, the bare seeing a Crucifix can teach him nothing. Children may be taught by Pictures, which make a more strong impression on their fancies than Words; but a Picture cannot teach; and at best this is but a very childish way of learning.

3. But devout Pictures are of great use in Prayer, the sight of which cures distractions, and *recals his wandering thoughts to the right object, and as certainly brings some good things into his mind, as an immodest Picture disturbs his heart with naughtiness.* But can men read their Prayers, as well as learn the Articles of their Creed, in a Picture too? For even good thought are a distraction in Prayers, when they call us from attending to what we ask of God; and it is to be feared then, that Pictures

them-

themſelves may diſtract us, unleſs we are ſure they will ſuggeſt no thoughts to us at ſuch a time, but what are in our Prayers; the Church of *Rome* indeed teaching her Children ſuch Prayers as they do not underſtand, and therefore cannot imploy their thoughts, may make Pictures very neceſſary to entertain them; but if our thoughts and our words ought to go together, as it muſt be if the Devotion of Prayers conſiſts in praying devoutly, an Image which cannot ſpeak, and a Prayer which is not underſtood, are like to make Men equally devout; ſhould Men when they look upon a Cruc fix, run over in their Minds all the Hiſtory of our Saviours Sufferings! ſhould the ſight of our Saviour hanging on the Croſs affect us with ſome ſoft and tender Paſſions at the remembrance of him! (which it is certain the daily and familiar uſe of ſuch Pictures cannot do) yet what is this to Prayer? Such ſenſible Paſſions as the ſight of a Picture can raiſe in us, are of little or no account in Religion, true devout Affections muſt ſpring from an inward Vital Senſe, which the Picture cannot give to thoſe who want it, and is of no uſe to thoſe who have it.

Thus I have, as briefly as the Subject would permit, examined the Doctrine of Praying to Saints, and Worſhipping Images according to the Expoſition of the Biſhop of *Condom*, to whom our Author appeals in theſe Points, and this I hope will ſatisfie him, what we think both of the Biſhops Authority and his Expoſition, and how little we like Popery in its beſt dreſs. And now it is time to return to our Proteſter.

And I hope by this time he ſees that there is ſomething more needful to clear the Matters in Controverſie between us, than barely M. *de Meax* his Authority; and therefore he reſolving *not to look beyond the Expoſition delivered by this Prelate*, I might here very fairly take my leave of him; but I cannot do this, tho' he be a perfect Stranger to me, without diſmiſſing him civilly with a Complement or two more. Papiſts *proteſting* &c. *p.* 27.

1. Then as to the *Invocation of Saints*, he obſerves that I deny the Biſhop has limited it only to their Prayers, which I own is a miſtake; and this is ſuch a Complement as muſt never be expected from a Doctor of the infallible Church, for he had occaſion enough for it, had he had a Heart to do it; but I hope I have abundantly made amends for this now

now by a fair and particular Examination of the Bishops Exposition as to that Point; and indeed M. *de Meaux* himself gave the occasion for this, by not owning it in its due place, when he expounded the Decree of the Council, which teaches them to fly to the aid and assistance of the Saints as well as to their Prayers, but shuffling it into the middle of a sentence at some distance, where no Man would expect it: When Expositors dodge at this rate, they may thank themselves if they are mistaken.

P. 18. 2*ly* and 3*dly*, He takes Sanctuary again in the Bishops Authority to justifie his renouncing *the Popes personal Infallibility, and the deposing Doctrine*, as no Articles of Faith: But tho' the Bishop indeed do wave *some things*, as he says, *which are disputed of in the Schools*, as no Articles of Faith, yet he does not say what they are, much less name *the Popes personal Infallibility, and the deposing power*; and one would think he could not mean the *deposing power*, which is determined by General Councils, and therefore must be an Article of Faith. The Truth is, the Bishop has here plaid a very cunning Game, and men may make what they please of his words, as their interest or inclination leads them; if *Protestants* object the Doctrine of the Popes infallibility and Deposing power, he can easily tell them that these are School disputes, and not Articles of Faith; if the Pope or *Roman* Doctors quarrel at it, he has then said nothing in disparagement of the Popes infallibility and Deposing power, but has taught that Fundamental Principle on which these Doctrines depend, as in Truth he has, when he makes the Primacy of *Peter*, the Cement of Unity, and gives this Primacy to the Bishops of *Rome*, *as Successors of the Prince of the Apostles, to whom for this cause we owe that Obedience and Submission which the holy Councils and Fathers have always taught the Faithful*; though they have not said one word till of late of any such obedience and submission due to them; especially when we consider what he means by the Primacy of the Pope, that he is *a Head established by God to conduct his whole Flock in his paths*; which gives him a Supremacy over Bishops and Secular Princes; and how naturally this infers infallibilty, and a power of deposing Heretical Princes, every one sees, and we have reason to believe the Bishop expounded his Doctrine to this Orthodox

Exposition p. 52.

Sence

Sence in his Letters to the Pope, from the Popes Teſtimonial, *that his Letters ſhewed his ſubmiſſion and reſpect to the Apoſtolick See.*

As for the Popes perſonal infallibility, our Author in his Reflections (p 8.) denies it to be an Article of Faith, becauſe it is *not poſitively determined by any General Council*; in my reply (p. 47.) I told him this is no proof, that it is not an Article of Faith, becauſe the infallibility of the Church it ſelf, which they all grant to be an Article of Faith, was never poſitively determined by any General Council; and therefore ſome Doctrines may be Articles of Faith, which never were determined by any General Council; and I added, that if the Church be infallible, the Pope muſt, if he be the Head of the Church; *for infallibility ought in reaſon to accompany the greateſt and moſt abſolute Power*; but our Author thought fit to let fall this diſpute, and to reſolve all into the Biſhop of *Condoms* Authority.

His Propoſal which follows, I have already anſwered without a ſmile, but I cannot forbear ſmiling once more to hear him complain of diſputing; which he ſays *belongs not to the Repreſenter, who being to repreſent and not to diſpute, is not concerned with thoſe tedious Arguments.* The Caſe is this; In the Character of a Papiſt Repreſented, he had denied the depoſing Power to be an Article of Faith; the Anſwerer proved it was an Article of Faith, becauſe it was decreed by General Councils; to this, in his Reflections he anſwers, that every thing approved in General Councils, is not an Article of Faith, but only Doctrinal Points, and thoſe decreed with an *Anathema*; and therefore the Depoſing Power not being declared as a doctrinal point, and the decrees relating only to Diſcipline and Government, and not being decreed neither with an *Anathema*, it does not appear to be an Article of Faith: In Anſwer to this, in my Reply (*p.* 49) I propoſed three Enquiries, 1. *Whether nothing be an Article of Faith, but what is decreed with an Anathema?* 2. *Whether the depoſing Decree be a doctrinal Point, or only matter of Diſcipline and Government?* 3. *What Authority general Councils have in* decretis morum, *or ſuch matters as concern Diſcipline and Government?* This is the diſputing he complains of, and I confeſs he has ſome reaſon for it; for Arguments that cannot be anſwered, how ſhort ſoever they are, are very tedious; but how I could anſwer his argument P. 30.

with

without disputing, or how he comes to be unconcerned to defend his own arguments, I cannot tell; but tho disputing is not his Province, *yet in civility he will go out of his way with me*, and in Civility I will keep him company.

1. He confesses, *I prove at large that all definitions of Faith declared in General Councils are not concluded with Anathema's, and in this he willingly agrees with me. But this does not at all prove, that whatsoever is declared in such a Council without an* Anathema, *is an Article of Faith; and therefore nothing against us deserving any farther answer.* And thus he has very prettily altered the state of the question; he said the Deposing doctrine tho approved by General Councils, was not an Article of Faith, because not decreed with an *Anathema*: now if this argument be good, then nothing must be accounted an Article of Faith, but what is decreed with an *Anathema*: In opposition to which I proved that several Doctrines which they themselves account Articles of Faith, have been decreed by general Councils without *Anathema's*; and he grants that I have proved this; and if I have, I am sure his argument is lost, for then the deposing Doctrine may be an Article of Faith, tho it be not confirmed with an *Anathema:* and now instead of proving, that no Doctrine is an Article of Faith which is not decreed with an *Anathema*, he complains that I have not proved that every Doctrine which is decreed without an *Anathema*, is an Article of Faith, which is nothing at all to the purpose: We knew not where to find the Articles of the *Romish* Faith, but in the decrees of their Councils; and finding the Popes power to depose heretical Princes there, we took it for an Article of their Faith: no, says the Reflecter, that is a mistake, it is no Article of Faith, because it is not decreed with an *Anathema*: we examine the matter, and find it otherwise, that Articles of Faith are decreed without *Anathema's*: yes, says the Protester, this may be, but you must prove still that every Doctrine which is decreed *without an Anathema* is an Article of Faith; which is a very easie matter to do after this; for if being decreed with or without an *Anathema*, make no distinction as to this matter, then the Decree it self in doctrinal Points must make an Article of Faith; if some Doctrines which are acknowledged to be Articles of the *Romish* Faith are decreed without *Anathema's*, then it is no argument against

againſt any Doctrine, being an Article of Faith, that it has no *Anathema* annexed to it; ſo that our Author is wonderful uncertain what to call an Article of Faith; if we call the decrees of their Councils Articles of their Faith, No, ſays he, every Decree is not an Article of Faith, but only what is decreed with an *Anethema*; if we conſute this diſtinction, and prove that Articles of Faith are decreed without *Anathema's*, then he can diſtinguiſh no further; but requires us to prove, that every Doctrine decreed without an *Anethema* is an Article of Faith, that is, that the decree of their Church makes an Article of their Faith: And if that don't, I would deſire to know of him, what does. And had I not reaſon then to ſay, *that it is wonderful hard to know what their Faith is*, when he himſelf cannot tell what it is that makes an Article of Faith, and their moſt Learned Divines ſo much differ about this matter; ſome allowing that to be an Article of Faith, which others reject.

2*ly*. The ſecond enquiry was, Whether the Depoſing decree be a Doctrinal point, or only matter of Diſcipline and Government; and in anſwer to this I told him, *That a Decree what ſhall be done, includes a virtual Definition of that Doctrine on which that Decree is founded.* To this he oppoſes what I ſay under the next head, *That in the Council of the Apoſtles at* Jeruſalem, *there was a Decree of Manners, yet it contained no Definition of Doctrine.* Not expreſly indeed, but virtually it does, as I ſaid before. My buſineſs there, was to vindicate the Authority of Councils in thoſe Decrees which relate to Manners, as not leſs Obligatory than the Decrees of Faith; and I obſerved that the only Apoſtolical Council we have an account of in Scripture, *Viz.* the Council at *Jeruſalem*, *Acts* 15. was of this nature; for the only Decrees made in it, were *to abſtain from Meats offered to Idols, and from Blood, and from things Strangled, and from Fornication*; and I obſerved, they might as well object here, (to invalidate this Decree) as they do againſt the Depoſing Decree, that there is no point of Doctrine determined in it. And how does this contradict what I before aſſerted? *That a Decree what ſhall be done, includes a virtual Definition of that Doctrine on which that Decree is founded.*

But however he ſaies, *This Decree of what was to be done, did not include a virtual Definition of that Doctrine on which the De-*

cree was founded; for if it had, then the Doctrine of abſtaining from Blood and Strangled meats, had been an Article of Faith. But what does he think of *abſtaining from Fornication, and from Meats offered to Idols*, which are contained in the ſame Decree? is not that a neceſſary Doctrine, and virtually contained in that Decree? I never ſaid, That every Decree of Manners muſt be immediately founded on an Article of Faith: but I ſaid, every Decree of Manners is founded on ſome Doctrine, (whether it be in a ſtrict ſenſe an Article of Faith, or not) and includes a virtual Definition of that Doctrine. The Decree to abſtain from Fornication includes this Doctrine, that Fornication is unlawful under the Goſpel; and the Decree for Gentile Converts to abſtain from meats offered to Idols, ſuppoſes the ſame; and the Decree to *abſtain from Blood*, and *from things Strangled*, includes this doctrinal Definition, That it was unlawful for *Gentile* Chriſtians at that time to uſe their Chriſtian Liberty in thoſe matters, to the offence and ſcandal of believing *Jews*. The matter in ſhort is this: Every Decree which commands the doing any thing, muſt contain a virtual Definition that ſuch a thing may be lawfully done: and every Decree which forbids the doing any thing, does withal define, that ſuch a thing is either abſolutely unlawful in it ſelf, or highly inexpedient, and therefore unlawful in ſuch Circumſtances to be done: this is as neceſſary as it is to command nothing but what is lawful, and to forbid nothing but what is either unlawful, or highly inexpedient. And therefore when the Church of *Rome* Decrees the depoſing Heretical Princes, or the favourers of Hereticks: She virtually defines, that it is lawful to depoſe Princes, which is a doctrinal Definition, and may in a large ſenſe be called an Article of Faith, as that ſignifies all Doctrinal points propoſed to us to be believed, as I obſerved in my Reply (*p.* 50).

3. The third Enquiry was, Whether the Authority of the Church be not as ſacred in decrees of Manners, as in Articles of Faith? for the proof of which, I urged the Council at *Jeruſalem*, and ſhew'd, *That Rules of Diſcipline and Government to direct the lives and manners of men, is the only proper ſubject of Eccleſiaſtical Authority*, P. 55. And here where he ſhould have taken notice of the Council of *Jeruſalem*, he ſays nothing of it, but only ſays, (*p.* 32.) that I *urge out of* Canus *and* Bellarmine, *that General*

General Councils cannot err even in ſuch decrees, when they relate to things neceſſary to ſalvation, and which concern the whole Church. And when I have proved the Depoſing Decree to be of this nature, and eſteemed as ſuch by their Church, I may then deſerve a farther conſideration. What their Church will eſteem, if he may be the Expounder of it, is nothing to the purpoſe, for we argue not from their private *eſteeming*, but from their publick Definitions; and if a General Decree for the government of the whole Church, concern the whole Church, and if to command a ſin concerns mens ſalvation, then the Depoſing decree does; for if it be unlawful to depoſe Heretical Princes, it is more than a ſingle ſin to do it: and if they will grant, that General Councils cannot command a ſin, then they muſt grant, that it is lawful to depoſe Heretical Princes: and I agree with him, that this does deſerve a farther Conſideration, and ſhall be glad to hear his thoughts of it.

This Author in his Reflections (*p.* 10.) proves that Popes themſelves own, that the *depoſing power* is no Article of Faith, *in letting ſo many open and poſitive aſſerters of the no-depoſing power paſs without any cenſure of hereſie.* This in my Reply (*p.* 57.) I attribute *to their want of power. For Princes will not be depoſed now, nor ſuffer thoſe to be cenſured who deny the depoſing Power.* This in his proteſtation (*p.* 32.) he ſays, *Is ſpoke like an Oracle*, but *he expects ſome better Argument than my bare aſſurance of what the Pope would do if he had power.* And I thought I had given him a better argument than my bare word for it, *viz.* the experience of former Ages, what Popes did when they had power: for tho the infallible Chair may diſſemble a little, when circumſtances of affairs require it, yet ſure it is not given to change.

What follows about the worſhip of Saints and Images, I ſuppoſe has been ſufficiently anſwered already, but I cannot but obſerve a very pleaſant argument he has againſt what I aſſert, *That no intention can alter the nature of actions, which are determined by a divine or human Law.* Whereby I prove, that if they do ſuch things, as in the account of the Divine Law are idolatrous, their intention not to commit Idolatry will not excuſe them: This he ſays (*p.* 36.) *a Quaker might as reaſonably make uſe of for the juſtifying his yea's and his nay's, and his other points of Quakeriſm.* For if he ſhould ſay, *No intention can alter the nature of actions, which are determined by a divine or human law, but Swear*

not at all, neither be ye called Masters; and let your communication be yea, yea, nay, nay, are actions or things determined by the divine law, therefore the intention of doing no evil in them, cannot excuse the doing otherwise than is there determined, from the guilt of sin. But will our Protester say, that the Divine Law does forbid all swearing? then I grant that the Quakers are in the right, and no intention will justifie swearing; but St. *James* must be expounded so as to reconcile his words with other passages in Scripture, which allow of swearing; and could he shew us where bowing, and kissing, and kneeling, and praying before an Image is in any sence allow'd in Scripture, then we would grant also, that the direction of the intention would justifie such a use of these actions, as the Scripture allows: but what is absolutely forbid to be done, no intentiou can excuse, which is our present case here. He concludes all with two or three Requests, which must be briefly consider'd.

P. 37. 1. *That he* (the Replier) *will use his interest with Protestants, to hold to what he saies they do, and charge us with nothing but what we expresly profess to Believe and Practice.* Now I can assure him there is no need of using my interest with Protestants to do this, for I hope they are naturally inclined to to be honest: but there are so many *us*'s among them, that possibly some Protestants may mistake one *us* for another. They practice indeed generally much alike, but they believe differently, and they represent d fferently, and they expound the Doctrine of their Councils differently; and I hope Protestants may without any offence say how and wherein they differ, and I think we cannot be justly charged with misrepresenting, while we relate matter of Fact truly, what their practice is, and what their different sentiments and opinions are about these matters.

2. *That they* (Protestants) *pick not up the abuses of some, the vices and cruelties of others, the odd opinions of particular Authors, and hold these forth for the Doctrines and Practices of our Church; and that in charging any practises, they charge no more than are concerned.* Now this is very reasonable, if he speaks of such *abuses* as are not allowed and countenanced by the Church; and of such *cruelties* as are not practised, encouraged, commended by the Governours of the Church, and justified by the Decrees and Canons of Popes and Councils; or of such

odd

odd opinions of particular Authors, as steal into the world without publick authority, and are censured as soon as they are known; but as far as the Church gives any countenance and authority to such *abuses*, *cruelties*, *odd opinions*, I see no reason why Protestants may not complain of these things, and charge the Church of *Rome* with them, and not like that Church ever the better, which suffers such abuses, and applauds such cruelties, as *Papists* themselves, who have not put off all humanity, cannot but abhor.

3. *That as often as they tell, what they think of our Doctrines and Practices, they would likewise at the same time inform their hearers, that those thoughts are, as the Replier says, Opinions, Interpretations, and Consequences of their own concerning our Doctrine, and not our avowed Doctrine.* But this is a very needless caution, as I observed before; for our people do not think, that the *Papists* themselves believe all that ill of their own Doctrines and Practises which we charge them with; and I cannot easily see, how our disputing against the Doctrines and Practices of the Church of *Rome*, and answering the Arguments whereby they justify themselves, should betray people into such a mistake; for it is no natural proof, that two men are of the same mind because they dispute against one another.

Thus much for the Protester. And to conclude the whole, I shall give my Readers a short view of the whole progress of this dispute, that they may see what shuffling Adversaries we have to deal with.

When the Book entituled, *A Papist Misrepresented and Represented*, was exposed to publick view, and mightily applauded by those of the *Roman* Communion, and industriously dispersed, and earnestly recommended to the perusal of *Protestants*, a very learned and charitable hand undertook to make a true representation of the Doctrines and Practises of the Church of *Rome*, which he performed with such full and plain evidence, that the *Misrepresenter* hath not so much as attempted to charge him with any one false Citation, nor to show in any one particular, that he has misrepresented their Doctrines and Practises; but instead of this, in his Reflections on the Answer (if the Reflecter

flecter and Misrepresenter be the same person, as he owns himself to be) he makes fresh complaints of *Protestants* misrepresenting *Papists*; which if it had been true, is no confutation of that representation which the Answerer had made of *Popery*; The question then was, Whether the Church of *Rome* believes and practises, as the Answerer says she does, and proves by unquestionable authorities that she does. But this was too plainly proved, to be a question any longer, and therefore he rather chose to debate that general question about the Rules of Representing, and how we must know what is the Faith of the Church of *Rome*, and whether the Bishop of *Condom*'s Exposition have not a sufficient authority given to it by the Pope and Cardinals, and Bishops of *France*, and what the authority of private Doctors is, and the like; but has not in any one particular shown wherein the Answerer has misrepresented them, that the authorities he alledges are not good, that he has put any forced and unnatural sense upon the words of their Council, or Catechism, or Doctors, or that their Church has by any publick acts contradicted what he charges to be her Doctrine or Practise. This he has not done, and therefore we have reason to believe this he could not do, and this is reason enough to conclude, that the Answer contains a true Representation of the Doctrines and Practises of the Church of *Rome*.

I did not think such Reflections as these worth the notice of the Learned Answerer, and therefore undertook to reply to them my self, and particularly examined every thing he had said; in return to this, he publishes another Answer, which he calls *Papists Protesting against Protestant Popery*; and I thought it would come to bare *protesting* at last, for his Reason and Argument run very low before; this I have now considered, and I think have not suffered any thing to escape without an answer; but that the Reader may the better understand what a formidable Adversary this is, I shall briefly compare the Reply with his Answer, and then leave him to judg of the ingenuity and honesty of the Protester.

In answer to his fresh complaint of Misrepresenting, in my Reply I considered what it is to Misrepresent, *viz.* To charge them

them with ſuch Doctrines and Practiſes as the Church of *Rome* diſowns; and proved from his own Character of a *Papiſt* Miſrepreſented, that we are no Miſrepreſenters; for what he makes us charge them with believing and doing, in the *Character of a Papiſt Miſrepreſented*, that he owns and defends in the *Character of a Papiſt Repreſented*; and the only difference in moſt Caſes between theſe two *Characters* is this, That in the *Character of a Papiſt Miſrepreſented* he puts in all the ill things which *Proteſtants* ſay of their Faith and Worſhip, and in the *Character of a Papiſt Repreſented* he ſays all the good things he can of it; but this I told him does not belong to Repreſentation, but Diſpute, and therefore whatever guilt we charge their Doctrines and Practiſes with, this is not to miſrepreſent, while we charge them with nothing but what is their Faith and Practiſe; to Repreſent in this ſenſe is only to report matter of fact; and he who reports truly, cannot miſrepreſent. If we charge them with any guilt, which they think they are not chargeable with, this becomes matter of diſpute; and it is not enough to confute ſuch a charge, to tell the World, that they do not believe ſo ill of their own Doctrines and Practiſes as we *Proteſtants* do. By this Rule I examined the Thirty ſeven particulars of his *Character*, and carefully diſtinguiſhed between matters of repreſentation and diſpute, and all this he grants, and yet in his Anſwer falls a proteſting againſt *Proteſtant Popery*, as if we had made a new Religion for them; whereas we only tell them what the faults of their Religion is; and this he calls *Proteſtant Popery*, That is, the judgment of *Proteſtants* concerning *Popery*; and this he *proteſts* againſt, which is a much eaſier way than to confute it.

And now inſtead of defending his own *Characters*, wherein he had charged us with miſrepreſenting *Papiſts*, and which I had proved, and he in effect granted to be no miſrepreſentation; he ſeeks about to find out ſome new *Proteſtant* Miſrepreſenters, and fills up ſeveral Pages with Citations out of the Manual of *John* Archbiſhop of *York*, Mr. *Sutcliff*, and others. Now in the firſt place he ought to have ſhown, that the diſtinction between matters of repreſentation and diſpute, by which I anſwer'd his own Characters, will not juſtify theſe

Miſre-

Misrepresenters also, as most certainly it will, and a Hundred more if he can find them; but he saies not one word of this, but only cites their words, and calls it misrepresenting. But besides this, he has used very foul play to make Misrepresenters of them; The Archbishop only transcribes out of Popish Authors, and cites his authorities; the Protester sets all down as the Archbishops words, without letting his Reader know that *Papists* teach these things, and that the Archbishop only repeats them after them. But besides concealing the Popish authorities to which they refer, he has taken another course with Mr. *Sutcliff*, has set down only half sentences, and concealed both the authorities and the reasons he alledges for what he saies, which is in a strict and proper sense to misrepresent. All that he answers to that distinction between representing and disputing, which he allows to be good, is this, That the common people do not distinguish these matters, but look upon all to be equally the Faith of *Papists*; That is, if they hear any man call the worship of Images Idolatry, they do as verily think that *Papists* believe Idolatry lawful (as he saies in his *Character*) as that they worship Images, *risum teneatis!* and thus much for Representing.

The next dispute is about the rule of Representing. In his Introduction to *A Papist Misrepresented*, &c. he appeals to the Council of *Trent*, and *Catechism ad Parochos*; this the Answerer likes well, but tells him, 1. That *he shows no authority he hath to interpret that Rule in his own sense, against the Doctrine of many others as zealous for their Church as himself*, as he does *in the Popes Personal Infallibility, and the Deposing Power*, which he saies, *are no Articles of Faith*, though other zealous *Papists* say they are, and asks *what authority he has to declare the sence of the Council of* Trent, *when the Pope has expresly forbidden all Prelates to do it, and reserved it to the Apostolical See.* 2. The Answerer tells him, *That he leaves out, in the several particulars, an essential part of the character of a Papist since the Council of* Trent, *which is, that he doth not only believe the Doctrine there defined, to be true, but to be necessary to Salvation.* 3. *That he never sets down what it is, which makes any Doctrine to become a Doctrine of their Church.* 4. *That he makes use of the Authority of particular Divines, as delivering the sense of their*

Doctrines and Practises of the Church of *Rome* truly represented, p. 6. *Ed.* 2.

Bulla Pii quarti super confirm. Concil. Trid.

their Church, when there are ſo many of greater Authority againſt them: whereas, if we proceed by his own rule, the greater number is to carrry it. Theſe were all very material objections, and did deſerve to be conſidered; but as for the three laſt, he takes no notice of them in his Reflections, and ſays very little to the firſt.

The Anſwerer had asked, *How the Council of* Trent *comes to be the Rule and Meaſure of Doctrine to any here* (in *Englund*) *where it was never received?* (p. 4.) To this he anſwers in his Reflections, (p. 5.) *That the Council of* Trent *is received here, and all the Catholick World, as to all its Definitions of Faith.* But I told him in my Reply, (*p.* 51.) that the meaning of that Queſtion was not, *Whether it was owned by private Catholicks, but by what publick Act of Church or State it had been received in* England, *as it had been in other Catholick Countries*; and this he ſays nothing to, and therefore might as well have let it alone at firſt.

I reinforced the Bull of Pope *Pius 4th*, againſt any private mans interpreting the Council according to his own private Senſe; ſhewed the Reaſon and Policy of it, and what a preſumption it is for a private man, when their Divines differ in their Opinions about any Doctrine, to call one Opinion Popery Repreſented, and the other Popery Miſrepreſented, as our Author has done in the Articles of the Popes perſonal Infallibility, and the Depoſing Power, as if *Bellarmin* and *Suarez* muſt not paſs for good Catholicks, but for Miſrepreſenters, becauſe they do not believe in theſe Points, as our Repreſenter does? and this he takes no further notice of.

But to prove that he has not interpreted the Council according to his own private Senſe, he appeals to the Biſhop of *Condom*'s Expoſition, which is approved by the Pope himſelf, and therefore *has the Authority of the See Apoſtolick.* To this I anſwered, that *Bellarmin*'s Controverſies had as great an Atteſtation from Pope *Sixtus 5.* as the Biſhop of *Condom*'s from this preſent Pope; to which he gives no Anſwer; and I obſerved from *Canus*, that the Popes private Approbation is not the Authority of the See Apoſtolick, but only his Judgment, *ex Cathedra*; and to this he gives no Anſwer, but Shuffles a little about

Reflect. p. 7.

Reply, p. 44.

Papists Prot. p. 25 *a private, malicious*, and *inconsiderate* Judgment, which I have now answered, and makes a new Flourish about the several Translations, and great approbation which has been given to this Exposition, which I have again said something to, tho I need not have said any thing, had I before seen the Preface to the Answer to the Bishop of *Condom*, and I guess our Author will never mention it more, and then what becomes of his Characters.

Reflect. p 8. Reply, p. 47. He denied the *Popes Personal Infallibility to be an Article of Faith because not positively determined by any General Council.* In answer to which I told him, that other *Roman* Divines did believe it an Article of Faith. That the Churches Infallibility was not determined by any General Council, no more than the Popes Infallibility, and yet was owned by them as an Article of Faith; that if there be any Infallibility in the Church, the Pope as the Supreme Pastor, has the fairest pretence to it. For Infallibility ought in reason to accompany the greatest and most absolute Power; and this he has passed over silently.

Refl. p. 8, 9. Next comes *the Deposing Power*, which has as evidently been declared in General Councils, as Transubstantiation; and how comes this to be no Article of Faith? To this he answers, that it wants an *Anathema*, and that it is not decreed as a Doctrinal point, but as a matter of Discipline and Government.

Rep. p. 49, &c This I examined at large in my Reply, and he is much concerned at it, that I put him out of his Representing humour by disputing; but he thought himself bound in Civility to say something to it, and truly he has been wonderfully Civil, as appears from what I have already said in Answer to him.

The Answerer in his Introduction had proved the Deposing Doctrine on him, from two sayings of his own, *That the orders of the supreme Pastor are to be obeyed whether infallible or not*, and that *Popes have own'd the Deposing Doctrine, and acted according to it:* and others are bound to obey their Orders, and consequently to act when Popes shall require it, according to the Deposing Doctrine: To this he answers in his Reflections, that he only made a comparison between Civil and Ecclesiastical Power, and therefore it is as unjust from hence to infer, That all

Refl. p 15, 16.

the

the Orders of the Pope must be obey'd, as it would be to say, that Subjects must obey their Princes in every thing they command, whether it be good or bad: and this I told him in my Reply, *I would acknowledg to be a good answer, if he would grant the Deposing Doctrine to be a sin*: But this I suppose he was unwilling to do, and therefore we hear no more of this matter. Reply, p. 55.

In the next place in his Reflections he finds great fault with the Answerers way of proceeding, which I reduced to Four Heads, 1. *That the Answerer in some Points owns the Doctrine* (which he has Represented *to be the Faith of a* Roman-*Catholick*) *to be the established Belief of the Church of* England. This I proved not to be true, by a particular Examination of those instances he gave. Ibid. p. 58. 2. He charges the Answerer *with appealing from the definitions of their Councils, and sense of their Church, to some expressions found in old Mass-Books, Rituals*, &c. This I showed also, that the Answerer has not done. P. 61.

3. *That he appeals from the Declarations of their Councils, and sense of their Church, to some external action, as in case of respect shewn to Images and Saints, upon which from our external adoration you are willing to conclude us guilty of Idolatry.* Whereas he thinks we must not *judg of these actions without respect to the intention of the Church who commands them, and of the person who does them.* P. 63. 4. *That he appeals from their Councils and sense of their Church, to the sentiments of their private Authors.* These Objections I answered at large in my Reply, but he has returned not one word to any of them, excepting the third, and how he has answered that, you have already heard. P. 67.

This is the new way of answering Books *a la-mode* of *Rome*; but the greatest Wits can do no more than the Cause will bear, tho a little prudence would teach men to say nothing in such a Cause as will admit of no better a defence.

FINIS.

ERRATA.

PAge 2. l. 32 *for seem*, r. *been*. p. 5. l. 24. *for Bulgradus*, r. *Busgradus*. p. 26. l. 32. dele *to* p. 27. l. 27. *for fine* r. *fierce* p. 35. l. 14. *for keep*. r. *help*. l. 34. *for you*, r. *them*. p. 100. l. 17. *for* Ζτωμλω r. γτωμλω, p. 115. l. 13 *for* 2*ly*, r 3*ly*. The Pages mistaken from 58. to 73.